National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, EDITOR. WITHOUT CONCEALMENT...WITHOUT COMPROMISE. EDMUND QUINCY, CORRESPONDING EDITOR.

VOL. XIII. NO. 7. NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JULY 8, 1852. WHOLE NO. 631.

Published weekly, on Thursday, by the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, at their office, No. 142 NASSAU STREET, NEW-YORK. Terms, Two DOLLARS per annum. Printed for the American Anti-Slavery Society, by NORRIS & JOHNSTON, printers, No. 21 Spruce street.

Selections.

SLAVERY AND THE CHURCHES.

[By Rev. J. Blanchard, President of Knox College, Illinois.]

LET US glance hastily at the history of Slavery in the American Churches, that we may learn wisdom from experience, and study principles in the light of facts.

Slaveholding has existed in the Christian churches of this country some two hundred and fifty years, yet many would have us hope that *the gospel, as heretofore administered*, will undermine and expel it. For almost this entire period of two centuries and a half, the Slavery question has been more or less agitated in the churches; yet many oppose the adoption of a rule excluding it, upon a plea of ignorance, and that the subject is not yet understood! The first slaves brought to New England were ordered to be sent back by the General Court. In 1791, President Edwards taught that "*while you hold negroes in Slavery, you do exceeding wrong, and that in a higher degree than if you committed common robbery or theft.*" In 1794, John Wesley denounced slaveholding as covering the slaveholder and all his possessions 'with blood;' and made ordinary slaveholding from the ordinary motives a disciplinable offence. In 1818, the Presbyterian General Assembly "declared the voluntary enslavement of one part of mankind by another, an atrocious violation of the most precious rights of human nature, utterly inconsistent with the gospel of Christ." In 1831, the Synod of Cincinnati, then the leading and most learned body of Protestants in the western country, declared slaveholding to be a "heinous sin and scandal; calling like other sins for the discipline of the church;" and appointed a day of fasting and prayer for the removal of Slavery from the Church and country. This was a full year before the New England Anti-Slavery Society was formed by Garrison, Buffum and others. In 1835, the same Synod of Cincinnati, of whom Drs. Beecher, Wilson, Stowe, Baxter, Dickinson, Rev. Mr. Brainard, of Philadelphia, and others, were then members, refused a Rev. Mr. Harrison leave to labour in one of their churches, "*because he is known to be guilty of holding human beings in Slavery*" And in 1845, the School branch of the same Synod suspended William Graham from the ministry, for teaching that Jesus Christ has "*authorized*" slaveholding "in the charter of the Church and all the laws He ever made for its regulation." There is not an orthodox Presbytery or Congregational Association, out of the slave States and west of the Alleghany mountains, which has not, within the last fifteen years, passed resolutions more or less stringent against slaveholding; and east of the mountains, most of the State Congregational Associations have been deeply agitated by their corresponding connection with those ecclesiastical bodies which tolerate slaveholding; and multitudes of individual churches, and some of the lesser ecclesiastical organizations, have spontaneously and without any concerted general movement declared against receiving slaveholders to their pulpits or communion tables; while many of the lesser sects and denominations, as the Covenanters, Seceders, Associate Reformed, United Brethren, Albrights, Friends Quakers, and, more recently, Freewill Baptists, Wesleyans, and others, have excluded slaveholders from fellowship, habitually and by rule.

All these are but a small portion of the declarations of opinions and means of enlightenment enjoyed by the American churches on the subject of Slavery. If ignorance of the subject is still a good reason for delaying the adoption of a rule excluding slaveholding from church fellowship, it is difficult to foresee when it will cease to be so. Everything has been said and done but *the one thing needful*, which is to exclude slaveholding from the church and mission organizations in this country, and thus strip Slavery of its religious respectability. Deprive it of its shelter in the Church of Christ, and, in the words of Albert Barnes, "there is no power out of the Church which could sustain Slavery an hour."

THE RAVENNA CHRISTIAN CONVENTION.

MESSRS. EDITORS: I was in atttendance upon the recent Christian Anti-Slavery Convention held at Ravenna. The number present was larger than I expected to find, and I think it was apparent to all, as it was to me, that the intellect and heart of the members generally were deeply pervaded by the influence of the gospel.

There were passages in the debates, as there are in all mass conventions, which should not have been uttered; and while all the members belonging to evangelical churches agreed that communion with slaveholders, and with churches that sanctify Slavery by fellowshiping slaveholders, is wrong, yet there were others who desired to extend the discipline of the church still farther than this. On the common ground there was no dissent. To the more stringent rule some had objections. The question of duty in this matter was discussed kindly, and, in the end, the published action of the Convention was generally concurred in.

The Wednesday evening session of the Convention was, to my mind, painfully interesting. Some things were stated concerning the defection of our benevolent societies, which I did not know. I have minutes of some of these statements, and I wish to ask, through your paper, whether they are true. If they are true, they ought to shock the conscience of every man and woman in the land, who sustains the societies that are involved in this dereliction, and in one case at least, in the *absolute immorality*, which was named.

From the minutes before me, I will refer to some of those facts—hoping that if there be a minister or layman who contributes to support those societies, and who can correct or deny these allegations, he will immediately do it. The statements were made by men who, I am informed, have a high standing for piety and intelligence, and I shall believe they are true unless contradicted, and shown to be false.

It was affirmed in the Convention that the American Tract Society have mutilated the memoir of Mary Lundy Duncan, and published a false view of her character and her sentiments. They have done this in order to propitiate the demands of the slave power. Sentences and parts of sentences written by that departed saint, in reference to the evils of Slavery, have been omitted. It was stated, on the authority of the New York *Independent*, that when Mrs. Duncan, the mother of Mary, was in this country, the Tract Society asked permission to publish the book, omitting the passages which they have left out; the mother of the deceased refused to consent, alleging that the book would then be a misrepresentation of her daughter's character.

To add to the turpitude of thus publishing a counterfeit of the sentiments of the deceased on the subject of Slavery, it was said that the Carters had published the work, in its true form; and notwithstanding this, the Tract Society mutilated it, and are now shutting out the true memoir, by selling their edition at cost, which an individual publisher cannot afford to do. Thus, the American Tract Society is not only acting as the sentinels of the slave power, to shut out truth from the churches on the subject of Slavery, but they are using the money which we contribute to publish these mutilated books at cost, and thus others are prevented from publishing the true editions.

Now, Mr. Editor, has it come to this: that the funds which Christians at the North contribute to the Tract Society are used for immoral purposes, and expended to publish a literature expurgated to meet the demands of the slave power? Let me ask Christian ministers and members in Cleveland, and on the Reserve, *is this true?*

In this connection, the pastor of a church in the vicinity of Cleveland, stated that his people had recently supplied themselves with the hymn-book published by the American Tract Society. This little volume is commended for use in social worship. On the evening of the weekly prayer-meeting, desiring to select a hymn which had a sentiment in it which expressed the sympathy which Christ requires for those in bonds, the minister turned to the old 72d Psalm, of Dr. Watts, beginning, "Jesus shall reign," &c. He selected it because he remembered that it contained the following verse:

> "Blessings abound where'er he reigns,
> The joyful prisoner bursts his chains;
> The weary find eternal rest,
> And all the sons of want are blest."

What was his surprise—and (I hope it may be said) righteous indignation—to find that the Tract Society had published the hymn, dropping out the above verse.

Thus, a hymn that has become a household song in Christian families—one of good old Dr. Watts—sung for generations in the churches, is garbled of its gospel sentiment, and the churches and Christian families may not even sing the old prayer, so full of joy and hope, that Jesus will give rest to the weary, and "open the prison doors," and give "deliverance to the captive." Even the slaveholding South is not so degenerate and apostate as this. This very hymn, with this verse included (which is the same language as that uttered by Jesus Christ), is still retained in their hymn-books, and sung in their churches.

It was also shown, by citing cases which we were told could be verified any hour, that the American Sunday School Union have likewise been guilty of this wicked subserviency to the slave power. They have, it is said, at the requirement of slaveholders in Georgia, dropped from their list of publications a volume entitled "Jacob and his Sons," because some truth was told in the volume on the subject of Slavery.

So the Presbyterian Publication Society have mutilated "Keith on the Prophecies," and the Committee of the General Assembly have dropped from the hymn-book, formerly used in their churches, the Christian sentiment of a beautiful hymn, because it uttered, almost in Scripture language, a prayer for the oppressed. The American Board of Missions have done the same thing, in publishing some beautiful stanzas beginning with "Who is my neighbour."

So the American Bible Society denounces the bulls of the Pope, and the laws of papal countries which limit or prevent the circulation of the Bible, and yet this same Society are dumb in regard to the laws of the slave States, which do the same thing in a worse form.

Now, Messrs. Editors, if these things are true, the conclusion is inevitable, that these societies are contaminated by the influence of Slavery; they are corrupting the religious literature of the churches, in order to give no offence to slaveholders. They are condemned, in express words, by Jesus Christ. They *pass by on the other side* of their robbed and wounded neighbour, as much as did the Priests and Levites of old. If these things are true, these societies have as little conscience, apparently, as a corporation of Cotton planters. If they can be bought to sanction and cover one sin, they can be bought to cover another for the same price. *If these things are so*, those Christians at the North who sustain them in this abandonment of moral and Christian principle are accessory to their guilt.

For myself, I shall withdraw my personal contributions from these societies, unless these allegations are disproved. If they should be, I shall rejoice to continue, as heretofore, to contribute my mite in aid of their funds. I fear that the things alleged are true. INQUIRER.

—*The (Cleveland, Ohio) True Democrat.*

THE WHIG PLATFORM.

HON. JOHN M. CLAYTON, master-builder of the Whig Platform at the Baltimore Convention, gave this account of the work, at a recent ratification meeting in Delaware:

I feel, fellow-citizens, that it is my duty, as I was one of your delegates to the Baltimore Convention which made that nomination, to give you some account of my stewardship on your behalf; and perhaps the information necessarily incident to the statement will be interesting to you. Well, fellow-citizens, your delegates from Delaware went into the Convention with an anxious desire to conciliate their brother Whigs throughout the Union. They were under your instructions, advocates of Winfield Scott, but were prepared fully to do justice to all the other distinguished gentleman who had been named as candidates. There was an anxious disposition, throughout that Convention, if possible, to conciliate the members of the old Whig party, no matter from what part of the Union they might hail. We organized permanently by the appointment of a gentleman, a friend of Mr. Fillmore, who proved an admirable President of the meeting, and discharged his duties with honour throughout the whole proceeding.

We thought we could afford to be magnanimous, and we resolved to yield to our friends, who entertained different views from ourselves in regard to the nomination. All went on quietly, under the management of the distinguished President of the Convention. At length a question arose in which the whole country was deeply interested—a question whether a platform of principles should be laid down—of faith I may call it on the part of the Whigs of the country, so that we might never be charged again with being a party having no fixed and settled principles whatever. We resolved to make a platform, and I had the honour to be a member of the committee which made that platform. And I think it my duty to give you some brief account of the manner in which that platform was constructed. In the first place, let me remark the Whigs came boldly up to the mark. The Democrats in their Convention did not dare to make a platform until they had nominated a President. The Whigs made the platform first. The Whigs resolved to lay down the principles by which they intended to be governed in their struggle, before they nominated any man whatever for the office of President of the United States. There was not one unkind expression uttered by any gentleman appointed to make that platform to another. All was conciliation and the spirit of compromise, the spirit to render something, and to take something as an equivalent in value. A determination to go as a mighty party should, pervaded the whole committee. And let me say I never saw one appointed to decide an important question more harmonious and conciliatory than the committee who made up the platform upon which the Whigs of the United States must stand or fall during this and future years. The first question to be decided was, what shall be said by the Whigs with regard to the Compromise measures of 1850? Secondly, what shall be said with reference to a protective tariff; and thirdly, and one of the most important, what shall be said in reference to the great question of improving the harbours and rivers of the country? the great doctrine of internal improvement.

On the first question a decision was made, which has been published, though, in many papers, incorrectly. It was this:

Resolved, That the series of acts of the Thirty-First Congress, known as the Compromise, the Fugitive Slave Law included, is received and acquiesced in by the Whig party of the United States, as a settlement, in principle and substance—a final settlement—of the dangerous and exciting questions which they embrace, and, so far as the Fugitive Law is concerned, we will maintain it, and insist upon its enforcement, until time and experience shall demonstrate the necessity of further legislation, to guard against the evasion of the law on the one hand, and the abuse of its powers on the other, not impairing its present efficiency, according to the requirements of the Constitution; and we deprecate all further agitation of the questions thus settled, as dangerous to our peace, and will discountenance all efforts to continue or renew such agitation, whenever, wherever, or however the attempt may be made; and we will maintain this system as essential to the nationality of the Whig party and the integrity of the Union.

Now, fellow-citizens, it is material to observe—and you will pardon this detail of drowsy facts on account of the importance of the subject—that while this platform of Whig principles gives the South ample guarantee, and such as she cannot fail to be satisfied with, on this great question, there is nothing whatever in it humiliating to the North. No man could desire anything stronger than that—no man ought to complain of anything in that.

Then we proceeded to declare that it was a settled Whig principle to encourage home labour and domestic manufactures, and that, too, by specific duties. After that, we proceeded to declare it another Whig principle that it is not only in the power, but it is the duty, of Congress to make provision and appropriation by law for internal improvements, and for harbours and rivers. There were other points not necessary for me now to dwell upon. You will find them correctly reported by the reporters, who went there, professionally, for the newspapers. With this platform, voted for and adopted by 227 to some 60 odd, we proceeded to ballot or vote by States for a President and Vice President of the United States. Labour on the committee, on which I was engaged from early in the morning, and a subsequent late session, deeply injured my own health, and, after balloting for a time without coming to a result, I was compelled to leave my seat, and one of the alternates whom you appointed, was substituted. You know that on the 53d ballot Winfield Scott, of New Jersey, received a decided majority of the votes in that Convention, and then was unanimously declared to be the standard-bearer of Whig principles in the approaching campaign. Let me compare his position with that of his antagonist. We see, in the great State of New York, that among the Barnburners many have gone over to the Democratic candidate. One of the leading papers on that side of the question says the platform adopted by the Democratic party at Baltimore was adopted with all that noise and confusion which prevented my old friend, Gen. Cass from being understood. It was not, perhaps, adopted at all: and there was so great a noise in the gallery it was impossible to know what really was said. So, therefore, says the *Evening Post*, we can well afford to go on a platform never made, and we can agree to go for what was never voted. So, throwing the platform to the winds, and my friend, John A. Dix, coming up to old Tammany Hall, they all agree to go in together, and forget their past differences. Winfield Scott has the whole phalanx to contend against. His friends based their platform before they went into any vote on the Presidential question. Thus far, you see, the Whig course has been plain and open. There has been no shuffling, no evasion of any question presented to them, and they have met every issue manfully.

During 1840, I remember well, and you too must remember it, that General Harrison was called General *Mum*, because no platform of principles was adopted at the Convention of that day. So, too, in 1848, the same censure was applied to Gen. Taylor. But, my fellow-citizens, upon this occasion the Whigs have come up much more openly to the work—by declaring what they intend to abide by, and what are Whig principles—than the opposition party.

INFLUENCE OF LIBERIA UPON AFRICA.

In theory, the idea of sending competent Christian men to colonise on the African coast, as a means of civilizing and Christianizing Africa, is fair and hopeful. What the *facts* are in regard to the Liberia that actually exists—the men sent out being such as they are—may be quite another thing. We say it *may* be, intending thereby no insinuations, but only opening a question of fact for thorough examination. We are anxious to know the real and whole truth. The question of going to Liberia is now agitating the minds of some of the leading free people of colour in our country, perhaps more intensely than ever before. All the facts in the case, in respect to Liberia and its influence upon Africa, are to them especially important.

The paragraph below is taken from the *American Baptist*, and is the report of a speech made at a meeting of the Free Mission Society by Elder A. A. Constantine, late a missionary of the Baptist General Convention *in Africa*—a man who had been in circumstances to know whereof he affirms.

His address engaged the profoundest attention and interest, &c.

He spoke of the Colonisation movement and its influence upon Africa; of the relations of the colony itself to the native tribes in its neighbourhood; and of the deliberate and systematic misrepresentation of these relations by some of the managers of the scheme for the purpose of securing favour and patronage. For example, it had been reported some years since, during the administration of Gov. Buchanan, that no less than thirty kings had sought the friendship and protection of the colony, and solicited the extension over the territories of the colonial laws. Mr. C. had himself been imposed upon by this story, and had been led to conclude that the influence of the colony must be a benignant one to secure such results; but he had afterwards learned from Gov. Buchanan's own lips, that the thirty kings referred to, instead of voluntarily seeking the alliance of the colony, had only yielded a forced submission, at the termination of a bloody war, in which their country had been ravaged with fire and sword. Instead of being itself a missionary agency, through which the gradual enlightenment and Christianization of the neighbouring tribes might be anticipated, the colony exerted a corrupting and malignant influence, and was a mighty obstruction to the missionary work. In fact, instances were not unknown, in which it seemed to have assimilated to its own character and spirit the missionaries sent to labour under the protection of its forts and guns. Mr. C. mentioned the case of a Methodist missionary, who, entering somewhat largely into commercial transactions with the natives, was thought to have over-reached and oppressed them. A body of two hundred of them attacked him in his fortified dwelling—from the upper story of which, (being provided with sixteen guns, and an assistant to load as he discharged them), he deliberately shot down fifty of the assailants, when the rest fled away in terror. This man, sometime afterwards, found himself in the power of his enemies, and ascertained that they were preparing to revenge on him the death of their companions. Assuming the air of offended majesty, he bade them remember Heddington (the place of the above-named slaughter); assured them that it was not he that had killed the fifty men, but that his God, at his bidding, had slain that number and spared the rest; and declared that, if they raised a finger to harm him, he would call upon his God to destroy them all. Trembling at the thought of falling into the hands of so terrible a God, they allowed him to depart unharmed, glad to be relieved of his presence.—*Oberlin Evangelist.*

RELIGION AND CHATTEL SLAVERY.—Civilization and its laws say that to have two husbands and two wives living at the same time is bigamy, and is a capital crime by wife or husband.

Slavery abrogates this law.

Civilization and its laws say that the mind should be developed by education.

Slavery abrogates this law.

Civilization and its laws say that a man should be constantly aspiring to higher conditions, because brutalizing treatment and conditions tend to degrade and stultify the mind, to render the race a race of beasts.

Slavery abrogates this law.

Civilization and its laws say that licentious intimacy between a man and his servants tends to demoralize society, and should be punished by State Prisons.

Slavery abrogates this law.

Civilization and its laws say that to sunder domestic ties, to mingle human beings indiscriminately in order to breed human beings indiscriminately, like hogs for a market, tends to destroy the foundations of all morality.

Slavery abrogates this law.

Jesus declares that fearing God and keeping the commandments constitutes the whole duty of man. The commandments declare that man shall not commit adultery, and shall love his neighbour as himself; and common law and common sense declares that he who promotes adultery commits the crime itself.

Slavery then wars against Jesus.

The priesthood informs us that the Bible contains the only rules and regulations which can ensure our everlasting safety.

It is estimated that in the United States, members of the Methodist church own 219,363 slaves; members of the Baptist church own 226,000 slaves; members of the Episcopalian church own 88,000 slaves; members of the Presbyterian church own 77,000 slaves; members of all other churches own 50,000 slaves, in all, 660,563 slaves owned by members of the Christian church in this pious democratic republic!

If we were to talk then a thousand years, we do not see how we could render more forcible the expression of the foregoing figures, or add to the weight of the appalling inferences which might obtrude themselves upon the reluctant mind!—*Boston Investigator.*

PICTURE OF DOMESTIC SLAVERY.—A correspondent of the Lowell *Journal* writes from Mobile as follows:

"That the slave is a *curse*, is as well known here as elsewhere, and much more keenly felt, for it touches that mucus membrane so full of nerves, the slave-holder's pocket. Not that he fails to make money with his slaves. He does make it, but not two-thirds of what he might, with *honest* hired labour. Slaves are lazy, negligent, wasteful, and worst of all, *thievish*. Having a passion for *whiskey*, they resort to any expedient to obtain it. Many a devoted turkey's head falls a sacrifice to this slavish propensity. Many is the load of wood which is piled upon the wagon in the dead of night, when 'ebry ting am still,' and drawn by tired plough-jaded mules to—the driver knows where—and sold for liquor—the seller knows how much. Chickens and eggs are the principal commodities in which they secretly deal, though they often gather rice just before harvest, or dress a pig of a Sunday morning and carry it to market. One of these stolen pigs, weighing 25 pounds, was, to my knowledge, lately sold for $1. Many families, though they have a large poultry-yard, cannot get eggs enough for domestic use. All these and a thousand other evils which he cannot prevent, convince the master that the whole slave system is a moth in his pocket, a blight on his prospects, a loathsome incubus fastened to the very vitals of Southern prosperity. He looks with a jealous eye upon the rapid growth of the free States, and knows well its cause. Could you read the inner tablet of the Southern heart, you would there find inscribed, 'Slavery is our ruin.'

ALLEGED INFIDEL TENDENCIES.—The *Christian Observer*, the N. S. Presbyterian organ of Philadelphia, is out in an attack on Dr. Pomroy, for publishing any Anti-Slavery sentiments in the *British Banner*, and accuses him of holding opinions which have led some of their advocates into infidelity. The absurdity of this as applying to all who believe that slaveholding "is sinful, contrary to the Word of God, and not fit to be welcomed in a Christian Church," the *Christian Press* thus shows up in a most glaring light:

"To believe that man can have no rightful property in man, that members of Christ's body ought not to be bought and sold like brutes, tends to infidelity.

"To believe that man ought not to be crushed, body and soul, to be excluded from the joys of both worlds, in order to serve the interests, or satisfy the caprice or passion of another, tends to infidelity.

"To believe that young females ought not to be sold openly to the highest bidder for the basest of purposes, without even a mask over the foul transaction, tends to infidelity.

"To believe that a man ought not to be hunted and torn by blood-hounds, or shot down like a wild beast, or slain in any manner, to satisfy the vengeance, or maintain the authority of a master or overseer, tends to infidelity.

"To believe that an enactment which most palpably perverts the spirit and intent of our Constitution, and violates its letter also, which sets at naught every decision of conscience, outrages every feeling of humanity, which forbids what God commands, and commands what God forbids, has none of the moral sanction of law, and cannot, rightfully, command the obedience of any, tends to infidelity.

"If, as this writer declares, such opinions tend to infidelity, then, of course, the *exact opposite of these views* will lead a man into the secure haven of New School Presbyterian Orthodoxy.

"From such an orthodoxy we pray most earnestly to be delivered.

"If it be infidelity to hold such views, and to believe the contrary to be orthodoxy, we welcome such an infidelity, and repudiate such orthodoxy, and we believe that Christ does the same."

ESSEX COUNTY ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.—The above named Society will hold its annual meeting in Georgetown to-day and to-morrow (Sunday), and, as one interested in the Cause, I wish to call the attention of every friend throughout the county to this meeting, and to remind them of the present as an important crisis in the history of the struggle between the friends of freedom and the defenders of Slavery. Be our ideas of measures what they may, or however varied our opinions of men, we all agree in the sentiment of the necessity of a change in the public mind, that all well-wishers to their country should learn to hate Slavery in their hearts, and protest against its longer continuance with their tongues, and that to the moral agitation their should be no cessation. Each of the political parties has now defined its position beyond dispute or cavil. John Van Buren and Henry B. Stanton have basely betrayed the cause and their friends, and, with the two great parties shamefully committed on the side of the infernal system, the duty of the true friends now appears clear. We therefore say to them, come up to this meeting, and let our efforts for the slave be simultaneous with those for the master. Let us join hands with the men and the women who have stood erect in every storm, who, through good and evil report, have stood firm to their convictions of truth, right and liberty, and let it be remembered that while many of us have been running hither and thither, now after party and now after sect, sometimes moved by patronage, at others deluded by false friends, the friends of this Society have never lost sight of the slave in his chains, or the fugitive within our borders. They have been vigilant while we have been idle and vascillating, and can we, at this critical moment, do less than rally to this meeting and do what we may, by our presence, our voices and our encouragement, to give new life and fresh vigour to the Cause? Let our individual love of justice, virtue, and freedom, make the occasion one of interest, numbers, and effect.—*Corr. of (Salem, Mass.) Essex Co. Freeman.*

ARGUMENT OF GERRIT SMITH,

ON THE TRIAL OF H. W. ALLEN, FOR KIDNAPPING, BEFORE THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW YORK.

[Reported for the Syracuse Star.]

MR. GERRIT SMITH, in opening, said General Lawrence, last evening, hoped that the argument would be completed in one evening. In reply, he (Mr. S.) intimated that his own argument would occupy a whole day. This shows the difference in our estimation of the importance of the cause. Gen. Lawrence makes light of it. I do not. Gen. Lawrence thinks the case a very different one from what it would be had one of his children been seized and attempted to be plunged into Slavery. I do not. No doubt the children of Gen. Lawrence are very dear to him, and very dear to their mother. So were the children of Jerry's father and mother. Mr. S. continued in a strain of great feeling and eloquence.

Mr. S. then went on to say that there was never an instance where a Judge or a Jury was called to try a more important cause. He must, therefore, have time to do all in his power to do. The question involved is whether this country is to remain a hunting ground for human beings—whether liberty is to be a sham in the United States of America. Should he fail to do his whole duty in this case, he would wrong himself, wrong his country, and wrong his God.

Mr. S. expressed his regret that, by the decision of the Court, in reference to the pleadings, they were precluded from introducing testimony to show the part taken by the defendant in the rescue of Jerry, over and above that directed in the Warrant. But he submitted to the decision of his Honour with all deference.

We charge Marshal Allen with crime in the case of the attempted abduction of Jerry. What does he say? Why, that it was done according to law.

I admit that, if done according to law, he was correct; but if the law under which he acted was unconstitutional—if it was no law—then he is to be held guilty.

It was said that the merely ministerial officer was not presumed to know whether a law was constitutional or not—that the existence of the law was presumptive of its constitutionality. This might be true, when an officer was required to take a hog: he knows what a hog is; that it is liable to be taken by law for debt: but when a man is to be taken, and all his rights destroyed, a monstrous outrage to be committed, an outrage against which nature revolts—an act diabolical—then the officer should therefore know the state of the law, before he consents to enter on the work.

It is said that it was hard to punish a mere ministerial officer for executing a law on the Statute Book. But is it hard? Can any punishment you can inflict on a kidnapper compare with the anguish he seeks to inflict on the man he would tear from his wife and family, and plunge them in the horrors of Slavery? We are not called on to sympathize with the erring and criminal officer, in a case like this.

It must never be forgotten that an officer is sworn not to obey an act of Congress, but the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. S. went on with authorities and arguments, to show that the officer acts at his peril.

He would (said Mr. S.) now leave preliminaries, and enter upon the constitutional question.

The Constitution provides for a jury trial in all criminal cases. Why? There must be a reason for this. What is it? It is, that his character and property are involved in the issue. But a man claimed as a fugitive slave loses his liberty for life—yea, more than that, sinks his manhood forever. Not so the man who goes to State Prison. He is under the protection of law, and, at the word of the Executive, can be restored to all his rights of citizenship.

He had a question to ask. Can Congress provide that there shall be a Jury Trial in all Fugitive cases? If it can, it MUST. A MAY here is a SHALL.

If Congress takes on itself to enact a law, it is bound to enact a suitable and reasonable law. To try a man for his liberty for life, without a trial by jury, is unreasonable.

I do not insist that all unreasonable laws are unconstitutional, but I insist that all gross and palpably unreasonable laws are necessarily unconstitutional. This doctrine should hold good in a Court of law—for law has been aptly defined to be "the perfection of reason."

What is an unreasonable law, if to drag a man down to beasthood be not one?

He would insist that, in denying trial by jury to the fugitive, not only the spirit but the letter of the Constitution is trampled under foot.

He read from 6 Wheaton. 40 7-8, to show what a "suit" is. Mr. S. claimed that an action to recover a fugitive is a "suit" at Common Law. He went on to show that the claim under the Fugitive Law accords with the definition of a suit, by Blackstone and the U. S. Supreme Court. He read from the case of Prigg *vs.* Pennsylvania. A claim is made. What is a claim? It is a suit. It is challenge of the ownership of a thing he has not in his possession. The Constitution says the person shall be delivered up on "claim."

The Constitution provides that in all suits at common law, where the amount in controversy is over twenty dollars, a jury trial may be had. Now we will see what Common Law means. He quoted from authorities to show what common law is not. The Supreme Court tells us what the Constitution means when, in its 3d Article, it speaks of "law." The Court continues—"In a just sense, it includes all suits not in equity and in admiralty." Suits at Common Law mean all suits at law.

It seems to me, said Mr. S., that I have most triumphantly shown that this law is unconstitutional and void, in denying jury trial in a suit at Common Law.

It may be said that in the case of a fugitive, the value cannot be measured in dollars. But the slave claimant is estopped from this plea, for his claim is founded in a claim to property.

But if this be not a suit for property, what is it? It must be a criminal suit, then; and then we have a right to a jury trial. The gentlemen may take which horn of the dilemma they prefer.

But the Supreme Court—16 Peters, 616—have decided that it is a suit for property.

The general acquiescence of our people in this denial of the trial by jury is the most alarming evidence of the progress of despotism in America.

He then read from Justice Story, on the right of trial by jury—30 Peters, 446.

But it will be said, it is only the black race to whom this right is denied. But it is not true. White men as well as black men are exposed to its penalties. But if denied by this law to black men only, does it not prepare the way for its denial to white men?

He thought it abundantly shown that the Fugitive Law is unconstitutional in denying trial by jury.

But he has many other lines of argument resulting in the same conclusion.

His SECOND point was, *that the Commissioners under this law were not empowered by the Constitution to do what they are required to do.*

This law gives to them judicial powers. Read Peters, 16—616.

These Commissioners are not constitutional judges. Judges are paid salaries—Commissioners fees.

This is not an unimportant point. What is the object of the Constitution in giving judges salaries? To secure impartiality. If fees were given, there would be a temptation to favour plaintiffs.

These Commissioners are vested with judicial powers, but they cannot possibly be judges; therefore the law is unconstitutional.

Again: They cannot be judges, because judges appoint them. One Court cannot make another. If so, a Court might be called on to review a decision of a court of its own creation. This would be absurd indeed; moreover, the decision of the Commissioners is final, and cannot be suspended by another court, even by the writ of habeas corpus; and the law is therefore unconstitutional, for the Constitution declares that that writ shall not be suspended except in cases of war and invasion [Article 36, Sec. 1, defines Judiciary].

Article 2d, Sec. 2d, defines the power of appointing inferior officers of Court.

But a Commissioner—Judge as he is—is by no means an inferior officer. Shall we call him an inferior officer, when he holds jurisdiction concurrent with the Supreme Court, and decides on cases the most important that can come before a human tribunal?—the liberty of a human being?

If the Commissioner has the right to exercise conclusive and final judicial powers, he is a judge for life; if not a judge for life, he has no right, under the Constitution, to exercise such power.

He had recently seen that Senator Dickinson has discovered that to admit that these Commissioners have judicial powers, is fatal to the constitutionality of the law.

He denies that there is a "trial" where the fugitive is arrested, but that it must be where the claim is made. He went on to read from Dickinson's letter to Robt. G Scott. He claims that "Congress" cannot provide for the trial of the fugitive, but only that he shall be delivered up.

But the claim of the Fugitive Slave Law is that Congress has exclusive power over the question. It does not look to State courts or State legislation to eke out its proceedings. The Fugitive Slave Law provides that where the man is arrested, it shall be determined to whom it belongs, and declares the action of the Commissioner as final.

But Mr. Dickinson claims that in the case of fugitives from Slavery or from justice, they are only to be "delivered up," and that the claim is to be adjudicated where the claim is made.

If this be so, why not have the preliminary trial of both where arrested? How can this be answered?

From the logic of these positions, there is no escape.

But I pass from this, my second position.

My THIRD *position is, that this Law offers a Bribe, and is, therefore, Unconstitutional.*

To say that a law that offers a bribe is not unconstitutional, is the meanest of insults against the Constitution.

It offers the Commissioner twice as much to do wrong as to do right—twice as much to go for Slavery as for Liberty. Was there ever so shameless an act in all the history of laws?

I pass from this.

My FOURTH *position is, that the Law is Unconstitutional in allowing the Commissioner to decide the case wholly on Affidavits.*

The 6th and 10th sections show that the common law knows no affidavits. The law requires him to decide on affidavits, as to the escape and owing service, and allows him to decide the whole on affidavits. What a superlatively gross outrage on human rights. The laws do not allow a man to be deprived of his horse or his dog on mere affidavits. He read from 20 Johnson, page 35 Judge Livingston, to show the uncertain character of affidavits as testimony.

I here leave my Fourth line of argument.

My FIFTH *position is, that the allowing ex parte evidence is an unconstitutional feature of the law.*

It allows testimony only on one side—does not allow even rebutting testimony. Commissioner Morton, of New York, who sent Preston back to Slavery, has been denounced for not admitting testimony to show that Preston was free. But Commissioner Morton acted up to the law—acted as good as the la[illegible] law not only allows testimony only on one [illegible] that of the weakest kind. It virtually exc[illegible]stimony on behalf of the defendant, by requiring summary proceedings. The slaveholder may be months in preparing. But the slave has no such chance. It also expressly excludes the defendant's testimony. [Read from the law.]

In a land called a Christian and Repu[illegible]can land, is not a poor man to be heard as much as a rich man? Such a law must be unconstitutional, when made under a Constitution "ordained to establish justice."

Read from 6 Wheaton, 379—Cohens against Virginia. Also read from Lysander Spooner, to whom the speaker paid a high compliment, as an able lawyer and writer.

He went on to illustrate: Suppose one of the jurors—Mr. Blair, who was in his eye—goes to Texas to increase his property. He gets his property—is on his way home—gets to New York—is arrested, charged with owing "service and labour." The warrant does not say whether for a day or a year. It may apply to him, as well as to a fugitive slave. Mr. Webster claims that the clause in the Constitution applies to apprentices.

This affidavit, made in Texas, might be that he owed "service" for a day. No matter. Mr. Blair rises as well as he can, being in irons—Jerry was in irons—and desires to make his statement under oath. But, Mr. Blair, you are a party to this case. Yes, but so is the claimant. But you are the employed, he is the employer—you are the servant, he is the master. And this in Republican America! But, says Mr. Blair, this is a tissue of falsehoods; I have witnesses to prove it. I can't help that, says the Commissioner; I am not the good, easy Commissioner, like Sabine at Syracuse, who let Jerry get away! You must be sent back with a national guard, at an expense of $2,000, to save this glorious Union, and keep the flag of Liberty flying!

Perhaps it may be said, that the Commissioner may allow testimony to be taken. I deny that the letter or the spirit of the law allows it. It is an act of the Commissioner—no thanks to the law.

But it may be said, that his case can be adjudicated at home. But who will indemnify him for loss of money and of time? But I deny that there ever was any adjudication, at home, of the rights of a man claimed as a slave. For in the first place, no man is claimed who has not the damning blood in his veins. And secondly, the universal law of Slavery is, that the testimony of no man with the damning blood in him can be received when the claim of a white person is involved. I ask you, sir, if it would not be a mockery of justice, in your Court, if the testimony of every light-haired and blue-eyed person were excluded? who would longer claim that this was a Court of Justice?

Again: The Constitution provides that no man shall be deprived of his rights of person or property, without due process of law. It is claimed that the slave is not a party to the Constitution. Admit it, for the sake of the argument. But here every man is presumed to be a freeman; and to assume that he is a slave, until proved such, is in the face of all established principles, and is worthy only of that circular line of logic entitled to no respect.

My SIXTH *line of argument is, that the law is unconstitutional because it vests Judicial powers in State Courts.*

See 6th and 10th sections of the law. Satisfactory proof is to be made, before the State Courts, of the claim [read Martin vs. Hunter—1st Wheat, 330]. It is the duty of Congress to vest Judicial power only in Courts established by itself.

Connecticut Reports—vol. 7, page 293—Judge Peters. Johnson 17, page 4—U. S. *vs.* Lathrop—Chief Justice Spencer—all to the same effect.

Now, I ask your Honour if this law is not grossly unconstitutional in this respect? It vests all power in the State Courts, for the testimony is the effective power in the case. The State Judge does not take testimony to be passed on by another, but that which is satisfactory to himself. He acts the part of a Judge; and therefore the law, in attempting to confer the power, is unconstitutional.

My SEVENTH *line of argument is this: The Law is unconstitutional because of the gross interference of the Legislative with the Judicial Department.*

First, in requiring summary proceedings; second, in requiring a small amount of the poorest kind of evidence. The Judiciary is a co-ordinate branch of the government—supreme in its administration. Story 1, Wheaton 328, showing the independent character of the Judiciary. He was aware he was flying in the face of usage. But if the Legislative power has encroached on the Judiciary, shall such prescription be observed? If the Legislature may say, that in a certain class of cases, testimony shall be taken on one side only, why may it not say that, in another, testimony shall be taken on neither side? The day is not distant when the Judiciary will scout the idea that Congress can dictate to them that testimony shall be taken on one side only! If your Honour please, could such a thing be attempted in Great Britain? Let Parliament attempt it, and a revolution is at its heels! This is another evidence of the progress of despotism in our country.

This law abolishes the Judiciary—it is a blank. Sir, it is high time that the Judiciary asserted its rights. An independent, incorruptible Judiciary is a nation's safeguard and a nation's pride. The opposite, a nation's curse. Sooner would I have a legislature dispensed with, as under the Theocracy of the Jews.

But I pass on to the eighth line of argument.

. This law is unconstitutional because it requires no testimony.

I am stepping up in this argument.

I have shown that the case can be disposed of on affidavits.

I have shown that it can be disposed of on *ex-parte* testimony, and that mere affidavits.

I have said that a part of the testimony has been annihilated, and that all of it might as well be

I now proceed to show that it has all been abolished.

These manuscripts of records that come up from the South, in these cases, are of no more legal value than so many pieces of waste paper. For the State Courts have no more right to act in reference to the U. S. Courts, than in reference to the Courts of China. They have no power to administer an oath in these cases, and therefore the pretended affidavits have no legal character whatever.

My NINTH *line of argument is, that it is unconstitutional because it fixes the compensation for the loss of a Fugitive, through the agency of others, at a fixed sum*

from Chief Justice Marshall, that the Territories and the Districts are not States, in the sense of the Constitution. Read the argument of Marshall.

I now pass to the twelfth head:

The law is unconstitutional, because it recognises Slavery in the Territories.

The Territories are under the exclusive control of Congress, and therefore there can be no Slavery there. Read 4th Wheaton, 482.

My THIRTEENTH *line of argument is, that the Fugitive Law is unconstitutional in recognising the constitutionality of Slavery in the District of Columbia.*

Congress cannot make slaves. It was well said by Richard D. Davis, a few years ago, that Congress can no more make a slave than it can make a king. No intelligent person will claim that, under a constitution made to "establish justice," it is possible to make a slave.

If Congress can set up Slavery in the District of Columbia, they can set up Slavery in the forts, court houses, or post offices, if Congress OWNS the grounds and the buildings.

Read the power of Congress over the District of Columbia, and over all grounds purchased in the States, with their consent. The Constitution confers power of "exclusive legislati[on] [over] Slavery:

Slavery is constitutional in Maryland and Virginia; the Slavery of the District is the Slavery of Maryland and Virginia: therefore, Slavery is constitutional in the District.

Congress has illimitable power over the District of Columbia. And Virginia was so alarmed at this power, that it went for an amendment of the Constitution, confining Congress to mere police regulations over the District, but this amendment was rejected before the session was made. So that idea is cast off.

He referred to the claim that there were provisions in the laws of session. But if there were, the Provisions of the Constitution are paramount.

The laws of both those States say that their provisions were made "in pursuance of the Constitution."

Virginia made a proviso: but that part of the District was retroceded to Virginia before this Fugitive Law was passed; and as in Maryland, there was no proviso, beyond all controversy, the argument is complete as to the unconstitutionality of this part of the law.

If it be objected that this law refers to Free Labourers only, then the prisoner in this case stands confessed as a kidnapper; for in that case, it does not apply to slaves, and Marshal Allen has confessed, in the pleadings, that he seized Jerry as a slave.

There is no more a slave in the District of Columbia, than in Massachusetts, in the eye of sound law.

One thing more, here. I hold this, that this law is unconstitutional, because, under heavy penalties, to do that for which he may be punished. It is the same as though it said to Marshal Allen, in terms, "You must seize a free labourer, in Manlius. If you do not do it, you shall be fined $1000; if you do, you can be indicted for kidnapping, and fined and imprisoned."

My FOURTEENTH *line of argument is, that the law suspends the writ of Habeas Corpus.*

He had read Mr. Crittenden's argument to the President, and he had noted his sage reasons. First, that the law did not suspend the *Writ*, because it can't—it would be unconstitutional. Second, that it was not to be presumed, that Congress would pass an unconstitutional act! Very much on a par with the child's reason—"Because!"

Mr. S. went on to read the close of the 6th section of the law; and to compare passages in the law of 1793 with that of 1850, in review of Gov. Crittenden's position, and establishing that the words of the act of 1850 suspend the Writ, if they mean any thing.

He went on to show that the tyranny of the denial of the Writ of *Habeas Corpus* was in entire harmony with all the other provisions of the law. It was eminently fitting.

A large share of able jurists are of opinion that the law denies the Writ; and the President had his suspicions, which it took Mr. Crittenden to remove. Blackstone calls the writ the great writ of England; and should not any law, which leaves it uncertain, be trampled under foot, and be declared unconstitutional and void?

My FIFTEENTH *argument is, that it is unconstitutional, because Congress has no right to legislate on this subject.*

This clause was taken from the ordinance of 1787. Under the Contederation, it was not held to confer any power on the Government. Why should it under the Constitution.

He read the three clauses of the Constitution, relating to the good faith to be given to Judicial provisions—to fugitives from justice—to the rights of citizens in all the States—and in regard to Fugitive Servants—all of which he maintained were compacts between the States.

The provision was found as far back as 1763, as a provision between Massachusetts Bay and her neighbour colonies, for the reclamation of apprentices.

Congress has never presumed to legislate in regard to Fugitives from Justice—or in reference to the reciprocal rights of citizens. But it has legislated in regard to "faith and credit" of the Judicial proceedings—but the power to legislate is expressly conferred. If it was to be exercised by inference, it would have been left to inference in all cases—and the express power would be a surplusage; and we have no right to assume that.

In the case where power was granted, it was indispensable that it should be granted—for it was necessary it should be exercised. For one State could not be competent to decide for other States—for the law of evidence is *lex loci*. No power was granted in the case of fugitives from service, for none was necessary in order to give effect to the provision of the Constitution. Read from Chief Justice Hornblower—State of New Jersey against the Sheriff of Burlington.

Why is it, that Congress legislates in regard to Fugitives from service, and not in regard to Fugitives from Justice? If State action will answer in one case, why will it not in the other?

Read 3d vol. Madison Papers—page 1447—showing that Madison, in the Constitutional Convention, maintained that Fugitives from service were to be given up as fugitives from Justice—by State action. There is not a word in the proceedings of that Convention showing that it was the intention that Congress should join in giving up fugitives from service. It was to be left to the faith of the States; and it is a monstrous doctrine that the General Government can step in to supply their delinquencies. It is the doctrine of Centralization in its most frightful form.

Why is State Legislation to carry out three of these provisions, and not the fourth? Why, but for the demand of that power, which has well nigh swallowed up the liberties of this country?

But there is a shadow of reason for this power. The clause contains a prohibition on the States—but only on one point—that the servant shall not be discharged from service. But are we hence to infer prohibitions all around the compass? The contrary is the rule of construction. The very expression of the prohibition, on one point, implies Liberty on every other point.

But it is held that all questions relating to American Slavery are already decided by the Judiciary of the United States. I would bow to precedent to every reasonable extent. The decisions of the U. S. Supreme Court, in regard to Patents, ship owners, &c., are to be final, till other scenes and circumstances and times, are to act. But I deny that decisions to annihilate all human rights are final.

But if they are ever to do this, it is to be done very—very—very reluctantly. It is to welcome eagerly every attempt to reverse its judgments, and to bring them in harmony with universal righteousness and justice. Sir, I am not ashamed to say this; for, thank God, I live not for my day only.

I should be wanting in ingenuousness, if I did not say that the Supreme Court are entitled to very little respect for their decision on Slavery. A majority of that Court are traffickers in human flesh; and I should be false to my nature, and to every sentiment of manhood, if I could yield to the decision of such a tribunal, on this question, very great respect. [He made an exception in regard to John Marshall.]

It was claimed that all questions in reference to Slavery, have been decided by the Supreme Court. But when and where? In the Prigg case, it is claimed the speaker said he would examine the case: and if he did not show it full of such blunders as would deprive it of all claim to authority, he would own himself mistaken.

Prigg went to Pennsylvania, from Maryland, and took an alleged slave without form of law, and was indicted for kidnapping and convicted. The case was carried through the Court of Pennsylvania, and to the U. S. Supreme Court.

The only question in this case was, whether a person could take another claimed as a slave, from one State to another, without the aid of Congressional or State authority—that is, whether the capture of fugitives from Slavery, was self-executing.

[He examined the case at great length, to which no possible justice can be done in a mere sketch like this. It must be left to the full Report, which will be published hereafter.]

He quotes Mr. Webster, in his great speech of March 7, 1850, that the Constitution does not require that fugitive slaves should be given up, but that State Legislation only was requisite.

There is no justification in the language of the Supreme Court for saying that Congress has the right of concurrent jurisdiction with the States.

But if the Supreme Court had decided that the law of 1793 is Constitutional, it does not follow that in their opinion that of 1850 is. The two laws are not identical.

Referred to 5th Howard, 216, case of Jones against Van Zandt—tried in Ohio, before Justice McLean.

Wendell 14th, page 421—Chanceller Walworth. He could not find power in Congress to legislate. For that opinion he lost a place he had long coveted—a seat on the bench of the Supreme Court; a place which Judge Nelson obtained for giving a contrary opinion in the same case, in the Supreme Court below—obtained for an untruth, that which Chancellor Walworth lost by his fidelity to the sound principles of law.

My SIXTEENTH *line of argument is, that the law is unconstitutional because the Constitution is Anti-Slavery.*

The Constitution knows no Slavery. Mr. S. went on to examine the question of property in man. Quoted Brougham on the doctrine, that there can be no property in man, and said: Such is the language of the first statesman of England; when will it be the language of the first statesman of America?

Quoted Lord Coke and Cicero, on the principles of law—that that which tramples down personal rights cannot be law. The law is inimitable; embraces all nations, and runs throughout all time. And Cicero was a heathen! Would we had such heathens among us! we would have better laws, and a far better administration.

It is a common mistake, though a very great one, that human legislation can cover the whole field of human interests. Crimes cannot be legalized. There are various provinces which law cannot touch upon. Sumptuary laws are not to be obeyed. If a law were to be passed, prescribing what these gentlemen, Jurors, should eat or drink, how readily would they trample it under foot! But of what consequence is the thing eaten or worn, compared with the eater or wearer?

But monstrous as is Slavery—too monstrous to come within law—I will come down from this high ground, and, for the sake of the argument, admit that Slavery may be legalized. And I shall examine the Constitution, in the light of the ordinary rules of interpretation. It is not a historical question—it is a legal one. We are to ascertain the intention of the adopters—not of the makers. The intentions of the makers of a Constitution are of as much consequence as the motives of the lawyer who draws a deed for two parties. The other rule is to take the language of an instrument in its fair meaning.

To show the absurdity of looking into the views of the makers of a Constitution, he read from 2d Story's Commentaries, 224, and 1st Commentaries 887 to 392. Nothing but the text itself, says Story, was adopted by the people.

This was Justice Story, in his better days.

He then read from Story in the Prigg case, in which he went in for "History," "compromise," &c., &c.

Chancellor Kent, Commentaries, 3d ed., vol. 1, 243, that the instrument furnishes the means of its own interpretation.

If you find the letter of the Constitution ambiguous, go to collateral evidence, but only to favour Liberty. But I deny that we are ever to use these means to establish a construction against liberty. 20 Cranch, 390 You are never to give construction in favour of injustice, if you can possibly avoid it. If a man claim a constitutional right to my horse, he must show it in clear terms—much more, if he claims a constitutional right to myself. 20 Wendell, 322, shows that provisions inconsistent with the main purpose of an instrument are to be disregarded.

All admit that if there was no legal Slavery, when the constitution was adopted, it made none; that the Constitution only legalized what then existed.

There was no legal Slavery in the United States, under Great Britain. In 1772, Lord Mansfield decided that there was no Slavery in England; and that decision was law for the colonies.

But it is said the laws of the colonies were for Slavery. This is not so. All slave laws assume the existence of Slavery. But they were void, because repugnant to the laws of England.

Slavery was tolerated in England after this decision by Lord Mansfield; but toleration is not legalization. Black boys and girls were advertised for sale in England, in 1779.

But suppose legal Slavery had existed in America prior to the Declaration of Independence; it was killed by that act.

In such high estimation was the Declaration held, that in the first constitution of New York, it was embodied entire.

Whence did all the constitutions of America derive their authority, save from the Declaration of Independence? from the right of self-government therein maintained?

What is the *ground* of the right of self-government, set forth in the Declaration of Independence?

Simply, that all men are created equal, and entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

What wonder that this document is dear to the majority of the American people! What wonder that slaveholders should have called it, as some of them have, a "farfaronade of nonsense!"

The Constitution cannot be called *for* Slavery, unless clearly and indisputably so.

If doubtfully for Liberty, then we have a right to look into history to confirm its character for Liberty.

But if doubtfully for Slavery we have no right to go into history to confirm a doubtful character for Slavery.

The history of the Convention shows that Madison protested against having the word "servitude" in the instrument, and so "service" was put in. It was not possible to get the word Slavery in the Constitution: no more possible than to build a fire in the midst of the sea. Talk of a web, the warp of which shall be Liberty, and the woof Slavery!

Who made the Constitution? The Constitution declares—"we the people." Who are the people? The permanent population. Who are they? The voters? Then it was only for a small portion—not even all the white men. The simple fact is, that the voters represented the entire permanent population of the country—men, women and children. If there were any exceptions, it is necessary that they be expressed in clear and unmistakeable language.

The Constitution is ordained to provide for the "general defence and common welfare;" and that cannot be executed until the government has converted millions of enemies, within its bosom, into millions of friends.

Mr. S. then went on at great length, to maintain that the following provisions of the Constitution are, when carried into effect, wholly inconsistent with Slavery:

1. *The Congress shall have power* "to provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States."

2. Also "to lay and collect taxes," but "no capitation or other direct tax shall be laid unless in proportion to the Census," &c.

3. Also "to establish a uniform rule of natralization."

4. Also "to promote the progress of science and useful arts by securing for limited times, to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and dicoveries."

5. Also "to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water."

6. "The United States shall guarrantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government."

7. "No State shall pass any bill of attainder."

"The privilege of the writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in cases of rebellion or invasion, the public safety may require it."

8. "Congress shall make no law prohibiting the free exercise of religion."

9. "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property, without due process of law."

10. "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated."

11. "Congress shall have power to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such District (Columbia), and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the Legislature of the State in which the same shall be for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings."

Mr. S. then said his last legal point to the Court—he hoped to have something yet to say to these good gentlemen, the jurors—was, that the fugitive clause did not refer to slaves.

If the slave be not a man—if he do not own himself—he can not "owe" any man any thing. He is incapable of obligation.

If the slave be unmanageable and lazy, you can not look to the law for aid, any more than in case of a horse or an ox. If a slave be property, he cannot be "*held* to service and labour" by law, any more than a horse or ox.

Suppose the people who within a few years have emigrated from the North to Fairfax county, Virginia, were to be made slaves; would counsel say they would deny the right? I would thank them for the admission. If you cannot make white men slaves, you can not make black men slaves.

But will you say, that the provisions of the Constitution apply only to these existing laws, and not to future laws? At the time it was adopted, no such State as Missouri was known What then becomes of Jerry, and your Marshal who pounced on him?

Sir, it was said of Rome, that she had lost her liberties fifty years before she was aware of it. There is danger that this be true of this country. It was decided by the U. S. Supreme Court, in December, 1850, that it was in the power of the legislature of any State, to determine the domestic or social condition of any of its people. What! said Mr. S., all our inestimable rights, subject to the caprice of a Legislature! And this the law of America! That man derives no rights from nature, which are a part of his being, and belong to him because he is a man! Let this march of tyranny be rebuked by a MARVIN in America, as it was by a Mansfield in England. The speaker went on in a strong and powerful appeal to the Judge to stand by the integrity of Law and of Justice.

The Constitution guaranties the "free exercise of religion." What is that Religion? It is the religion of Jesus Christ; the mention of Sunday in the Constitution, shows that. But this law punishes me, if the panting, hunted fugitive, raps at my door at night, and I give him sympathy and shelter from his captors. Is that the enjoyment of the "free exercise of religion."

He had done with the law argument.

At about the time Columbus discovered America, the subjugation of the Moors in Spain was effected, with the exception of the single province of Grenada. Cruelty was ever a distinguishing trait of Spanish character; yet in the treaty between the Spaniards and the Moors of the province of Grenada, was a provision, that any Moor held as a slave by any of the families of Spain, escaping into Grenada, should forever be free and unmolested. Alas! that the United States has no Grenada!

But he had one question to ask. How came this stupid, this absurd, this wicked thing, called the Fugitive Law, to be on the Statute Book? It went through the hands of able men like Clay, Webster and others. But a compromise was demanded by the needs of politicians. The rights of white men, who could speak for themselves, must not be offered up. A sacrifice must be made of those who could not speak for themselves; and it was made The Fugitive Slave Law was the work of men, not as Lawyers, but as Politicians.

[The Reporter begs leave to say, that the foregoing is a skeleton of a speech of six hours and a half in length. His intent was to exhibit the *direction* taken by the able and eloquent speaker, in anticipation of the publication of the argument from his own pen. It is due, however, to Mr. SMITH to say, that not even a skeleton of his examination of the Prigg case was attempted, for the reason that it was one of those compact structures of fact and logic, that, like the cups of a Galvanic battery, it must be all there, or it is good for nothing. And the same is true of the argument showing that the Constitution of the United States is not a monster with two heads, one LIBERTY, the other, SLAVERY. Given piece meal it is valueless—therefore no sketch was made. Both will be read with great interest by intelligent members of the Bar of all parties at the North, and by the Bench, all of whom will thank him for his great research, and the logic he has applied to it. It is understood that Mr. SMITH will prepare his argument in full, with all its authorities and quotations, for the press.]

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

*** *All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns should be addressed to* SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, *New-York.*

†‡† *Donations to the Treasury of the* AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY *may be forwarded to* FRANCIS JACKSON, *Treasurer, at Boston; or to* SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, *New-York.*

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JULY 8, 1852.

THE WEBSTER FARCE.

MR. WEBSTER'S has been an instructive experience. If politicians ever learned in that school, he might afford them a lesson. It illustrates how utterly delusive are the best grounded schemes of Ambition in this country. If the poor man be wretched "who hangs on Princes' favours," much more miserable is he whose fate depends on the breath of an Oligarchy disguised as a Democracy. Mr. Webster must regard his life, if he be like other men, as a failure. He had fixed his eye on an object, the accomplishment of which was the aim of his life, and he has failed to gain it. It is no matter what subordinate successes he may have had. They fade into nothingness in the presence of the great Disappointment. No man has been more flattered than he by his party. No man has had his abilities, in a certain line, more unanimously admitted or more liberally rewarded, by the general consent of his countryman. As an advocate in the Courts he has had no equal. As a winner of verdicts and a compeller of decisions, he stands alone among his Cis-Atlantic contemporaries. And there will his permanent reputation rest. He has made no mark of his own upon the time, as a public man. In public as in private life, he received his brief from his clients and, for the fee indorsed upon it, argued their cause in either House of Congress. Now he was employed as a Free Trader and now as a Protectionist; at one time as the advocate of a National Bank, which at another he pronounces "an obsolete idea." But in every political scheme which he touched he failed. And success is the test of a Statesman's glory. A Public Man who has impressed himself upon the policy of the country in no one of its great features, will never have his claim to Statesmanship allowed by Posterity, however loud may be the adulation of personal friends or political sycophants.

None of the schemes of policy with which he has been identified, originated with him. He has been but the tool of other men from the beginning of his career. The crowning infamy of his life—the only act of his Public Life which will go into permanent history—was no invention of his. He only took up the Compromise Measures after they had been devised by Mr. Clay, and carried them forward as his instrument. It was only the prominence which he and his sycophants gave to his action in this matter, and the way in which he endeavoured to claim all the merit of those abominations, joined to the contrast which his action then bore to his previous professions, and the impudent falsehood of the Danger to the Union, by which he sought to excuse his tergiversation—it was these things only that have connected his name with that of National crime. Those measures would have passed without his help, and against his remonstrance. It is a political fiction no one believes that men are induced to alter their votes by any orator, though he should speak with the tongue of men and angels. The country would have been saved, if catching negroes after a new fashion could work out its salvation, without his furtherance. But his countenance was desirable as emblematic of the submission of the North. It was a delicious treat to the Slaveholders to see the forger of the Wilmot thunder devouring his own bolts. They saw the whole North, in his person, prostrate before them, doing them homage, and promising them suit and service.

> "There you and I, and all of us, fell down,
> And bloody Treason flourished over us!"

Slavery, like a faltering fiend, as she is, was liberal of her promises. She showed him in vision the round and top of sovereignty bestowed upon him, as the Saviour of the Union, by the acclamation of the whole country. At least, all that is conservative of all that is worst in our institutions of both the great parties, were to unite in a new and overwhelming Union party, which would place him upon the Republican throne in a whirlwind of patriotic enthusiasm.

This dream could not have lasted long. Though the Democrats lauded him to the skies, yet they would not admit that he had done more than his duty, or more than they had been doing, all along. They would not allow that his services outweighed those of their own chosen leaders. The numbers of those who were disposed to fall off from their old parties, in order to form a new one for his convenience, were found to be infinitesimally minute. His hopes then fell back upon the Whig party and rested there. He knew its long suffering and slowness to wrath—at least of the portion of it which he knew the best, that of Massachusetts. He had overthrown its long ascendancy there, which had almost grown into a prescription. He had spoken contemptuous words of the party and disdained in some of his speeches to name its name at all. He had openly encouraged its destruction by a new arrangement of political elements. But, still, he knew his men, and that, as they could not have spirit kicked into them, so they could not have subserviency kicked out of them. His party confined almost exclusively to State Street and Wall Street, refusing to perceive anything that did not accord with their wishes, would see and hear nothing which filled the eyes and ears of all the world beside. Their faith was great and they hoped to remove by it the mountains of impossibility that interposed between their hope and its accomplishment. Not even the desertion of the South in a solid body could cure their judicial blindness. The Slaveholders, to propitiate whom the great sacrifice had been made, refused to recognise Mr. Webster as the High Priest of that Mediation. They acknowledged the oblution, but it was only the hands of Millard Fillmore that they could discern and bless in the offering. They were not ungrateful, not they. They were not unwilling to reward merit in a Northern man; O, no! But not even this transparent artifice could restore common sense to Mr. Webster and his partizans.

They still believed that, when it came to the point, if they adhered to their man, the South would choose Webster as a lesser evil than Scott. As if the slaveholding Whigs had not, all along, intended that Scott (the only candidate with a chance for an election) should be the man. As if their pretended support of Fillmore were anything from the beginning, but a *fetch, a sham*, a hollow pretence of consistency, to enable them to escape from giving Webster even the shadow of countenance! But his friends refused to see anything of all this and persisted in hoping against hope, and in flattering their candidate with the most sanguine assurances of success, until the end had crowned the work. And then they were in as great a rage of disappointment as if the balance had hung upon the estimation of a hair, and had been turned against him by some signal and unlooked for treachery! Poor wretches, their punishment was almost greater than they could bear—though, certainly, far short of what they deserved for their alacrity in doing the dirty work, and uttering the base words, which they thought to be the price of success. There was not only "an infinite loss, but shame and dishonour," as Trinculo says, in what they had undergone. They had not only failed of their end, but they had made themselves and their candidate the most ridiculous objects which ever set a nation in a roar. Not the united genius of Hogarth, Gillroy and Cruikshank could produce so laughable a caricature; not Mathews, Liston or even Grimaldi could put themselves into a posture so comical as that of Mr. Webster and his friends on the memorable twenty-first of June. It *was* hard to bear. In addition to the soreness of their chagrin, to know that the whole continent was holding its sides and splitting with laughter at their expense, was a circumstance that could hardly be agreeable. It hardly could have been pleasant to know that every Democrat, every Free Soiler, and nine hundred and ninety-nine out of every thousand Whigs, regarded him and them as affording the most absurd and ludicrous spectacle that ever convulsed a laughing world. The only tears that the world can have for their disappointment, will be like those of the Matthew of Wordsworth, tears

> "Of one worn out with mirth and laughter!"

And poor Mr. Webster, too! Bad as he is, and infamously as he has behaved, one may feel a very little pity for him, in view of the ignominious end to which he has come. When the most atrocious criminal stands on the drop, or even when his ears have been nailed to the pillory, justice itself will relax into a sensation of pity. He deserves all he has got, but not from those that have given it to him. And the way in which they gave it to him was worse than all. To call him up from his bed that night, to make them a speech, his shirt fluttering in the breeze, to assure them that he did n't mind it! As a boy who has been flogged, assures his play-fellows that he was n't hurt! *He* sleeping sweetly that night! *Credat Judæus!* The Jew Apella may believe it if he can. The night that followed the culminating day of his existence—the day on which his eyes had been fixed for forty years—a day which, instead of crowning him with the success he had hoped and had been promised, had left him discrowned, defeated and ridiculous, the contempt of all of whom he was not the execration—that he was sleeping in peace that night! Who believes it? No one, who did not believe he had a chance of nomination and of election. To such a credulity no limits can be put. And, then, that impudent slaveholding delegation which, after refusing him even the empty compliment of one Southern vote, waited on him to extort an expression of satisfaction at what they had done! Coming, after they had kicked him over, to hold out the foot that had done it for him to kiss! And he did it, too. Though he did intimate that it was unfortunate that the record would never show the confidence in him which he was willing to believe they had. And, now, by way of a balm for his hurt soul, they are going to give him, what! *a dinner!* As a too indulgent mamma consoles an urchin that has broken his head, by giving him something good to eat. But it will be to no purpose. The dinner will be eaten and forgotten. The fumes of the wine will be slept off and pass away. But the historical fact, that, in fifty-three ballotings, Mr. Webster got not a single Southern vote, not even after it was beyond a peradventure that Gen. Scott would be nominated, that fact will be remembered as long as he is himself. And if it should be asked why this was so, we point to his speech before the Massachusests Whig Convention in 1848, which gave him the vote of Massachusetts in the Whig Nominating Convention of that year, and caused the secession of Charles Allen and Henry Wilson. Read that speech, and then that of the Seventh of March, 1850. Could the slaveholders trust a man, however hot his breath might be on their side, then, who had blown so very cold upon them a few brief months before? Ought they to trust him? Did they not read him like a book? Whatever the slaveholders may be, they are not *fools*. They know Webster to be, as Junius said of Wedderburn, "a man that treachery cannot trust!" They refused to put themselves in any degree in his power, or even to seem willing to do so. And they were wise in their generation.—E. Q.

MR. SEWARD has spiked one of the enemies' guns by the following letter on his own relations to Gen. Scott. It was rather a condescension, we think, on his part to make any such explanation:

WASHINGTON, June 26, 1852

MY DEAR SIR: Your kind letter has been received. It would be presumptuous on my part to suppose that any President of the United States would, at any time, or under any circumstances, invite me to a seat in the Executive Counsil, and equally so to suppose that the Senate of the United States would advise and consent to such a selection. Nevertheless, if there be one Whig vote depending at this Election on the question you have raised, I will not stand on a point of personal delicacy in the effort to save it.

I assure you, therefore, with entire frankness, that under no circumstances which I have ever conceived, or can now conceive, would I ask or even accept any public station or preferment whatever at the hands of the President of the United States, whether that President were Winfield Scott or any other man I have ever seen or known. In saying this, I am only saying to you what was well understood as a rule of my conduct by the late and lamented President Taylor, and has been equally well known and understood by Winfield Scott, from the first hour when my preference of himself as the candidate in the present canvass was fixed.

I am, with great respect and esteem,

Your friend and humble servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

JAMES B. TAYLOR, Esq., New York.

HENRY CLAY.

THIS paper, it will be observed, bore not upon its columns, last week, and bears not, this, any mark of sorrow for a public calamity. The class whom it represents is not counted among that large portion of the people who, for nearly half a century, have felt and manifested a devotion and enthusiasm for Henry Clay which has been awarded to no other public man of this country in this generation.

Loud lamentation, and even extravagant eulogy, are among the privileges of grief, and to be respected accordingly; if these are heard in decorous silence by those who respect the sorrow which they do not share, it is all the mourners have a right to expect. But such silence is not imperative when a man dies whose life belongs to the history of his time. If animosity ceases at the portal of the tomb, and the soldier grounds his arms when his enemy has fallen before the universal conqueror, the fact of death does not change the facts of life; and to pretend a grief we do not feel is not only to insult the memory of the dead, but to outrage the sorrow of those who have a right to grieve. It is not strange, therefore, that the friends of Mr. Clay reject the sympathy of his enemies when offered with eulogy. As he was the best loved, so he was the best hated of our public men; and those who loved him are indignant that others should hasten to garnish the sepulchre of him whom living they denounced, as now a traitor to his party, now an intriguing demagogue; in his younger days a gambler, and a duellist, and always a man governed by unscrupulous ambition, and never by pure and patriotic motives. If these things were never true of him, they should never have been said; if they were true, they should not be forgotten, and there should be rather a universal satisfaction that a long and bad life is, at last, ended, than universal regret that a great man is taken away.

It matters, we know, but very little to the people at large what the Anti-Slavery Press may say, but to the Anti-Slavery people themselves it is of consequence that, if it speaks at all, it speaks the truth. The condemnation which is awarded by Mr. Clay's friends upon those who were his opponents, is not of universal application. There is, at least, one portion of the people who, as they abhored his doctrines, while living, and regarded his life as only a curse to his country, so they have now no tears to shed that an end has come to it at last, and that Freedom has one enemy the less.

Mr. Clay was the GREAT COMPROMISER. Time is always just, and the title which the Present has given him, the Future will accept. It makes his fame now; it will make his infamy hereafter. Of other men of his day and generation, it will be said they believed that wrong was right; but what they believed, they did with a good purpose, though to an evil end. He knew the right, but maintained the wrong, and worked with evil intentions to evil ends. In his youth, he loved freedom; and had he been true to her, his native State might, long ago, have been free from the curse of Slavery. Perhaps, in that case, he would never have even hoped to be President, but it is certain he would never have made the Missouri Compromise, and have re-established Slavery in the valley of the Mississippi. He would never, perhaps, have been Secretary of State, but he would not, at least, have interposed the influence of the Government of the U. States between the revolutionary spirit in the Spanish Colonies and Cuban Independence, and the threatened emancipation of the Cuban slaves. He might not have been the father of the American System of Protection; but he would never have been the Protector of the System of American Slavery. What he was, we know; we can only guess what he might have been. But we can not guess far wrong. With his power over the popular will; with his gift of eloquence; with the advantage of his position as a Southerner by birth, and a slaveholder by inheritance; with his great popularity and unbounded influence among a rude people, whose social and political circumstances were as yet unformed, he held more than any other man ever did, more than any other ever can again, the destiny of the great West, South of Mason and Dixon's Line, in his hands, and could have moulded it to his will. But in sacrificing his own early instincts for Freedom to political ambition, he betrayed, first, his own State, and every subsequent step of his life was a renewal of the treachery to the cause of Slavery. No man could have done so much for the Right; no man has done so much for the Wrong. If his admirers were disposed to make one last Compromise in his behalf, they should gladly consent that his name should be forgotten, if the evil he has done could be interred with his bones.

TROUBLE IN THE WIGWAM.—The most intelligent and, at the same time, most zealous supporters of the Whig nominations do not, as yet, pretend to prophecy as to the result of the ensuing election; on the contrary, they assert that there are not, and will not be, for sometime to come, sufficient data from which to form a prediction that would be anything more than a guess. All which, we take it, means no more nor less than this: that Gen. Scott's chance will begin to be a good one when an unmistakeably universal public enthusiasm shall manifest itself in his favour, and not before. The converse of this proposition is, probably, equally true—that if no such enthusiasm shall show itself, then his chance is nothing at all.

If this view of the case be a correct one, then the developments of public feeling have a new interest as they arise. The fate of the day is to be decided at the outposts and by advance guards, and a skirmish has all the interest of a pitched battle. Especially if those who have been counted on as of Scott's army shall fall out by the way, it will not be long before the prophet may preach of the end of things with a good deal of confidence. Below we give, from the *National Intelligencer*, one of those signs of the times which will help on that consummation. The poor Whigs will begin to see that *their* attempt to cap the volcano is not successful:

WASHINGTON, July 3, 1852.

To prevent all mistakes and misapprehensions, we, the undersigned, members of Congress, adopt this method of making a joint statement to our constituents, respectively, and to all who may take an interest in the subject, that we cannot and will not support Gen. Scott for the Presidency, as he now stands before the American people, for the following amongst other reasons:

He obstinately refused, up to the time of his nomination, to give any public opinion in favour of that series of measures of the last Congress known as the compromise; the permanent maintenance of which with us is a question of paramount importance. Nor has he, since his nomination, made any declaration of his approval of those measures, as a final adjustment of the issues in controversy.

It is true the resolutions of the convention that nominated him are as clear and as explicit upon this question as need be; but Gen. Scott, in his letter of acceptance, which contains all that we have from him on that matter, does not give them the approval of his judgment. This he seems studiously to have avoided. He accepts the nomination, "with the resolution annexed." That is, he takes the nomination *cum onere*, as an individual takes an estate, with whatever incumbrances it may be loaded with. And the only pledge and guaranty he offers for his "adherence to the principles of the resolutions" are "the known incidents of a long public life," &c.

Amongst these "known incidents" of his life, there is not one, so far as we are aware of, in favour of the principles of the Compromise. In one, at least, of his public letters, he has expressed sentiments inimical to the institutions of fifteen States of the Union. Since the passage of the Compromise, he has suffered his name to be held up before the people of several of the States as a candidate for the Presidency by the open and avowed enemies of those measures. And in the convention that conferred this nomination upon him he permitted himself to be used by the Free Soilers in that body to defeat Mr. Fillmore and Mr. Webster, because of their advocacy of these measures and their firm adherence to the policy that sustained them.

To join such men, and aid them in completing their triumph over, and sacrifice of, the true and tried friends of the constitution and the faithful discharge of all its obligations, is what we can never do. The dictates of duty and patriotism sternly forbid it.

We consider General Scott as the favourite candidate of the Free Soil wing of the Whig party. That his policy, if he should be elected, would be warped and shaped to conform to their views, and to elevate them to power in the administration of the government, can but be considered as a legitimate and probable result. And, believing as we do, that the views of that faction of mischievous men are dangerous not only to the just and constitutional rights of the Southern States (which we represent in part), but to the peace and quiet of the whole country, and to the permanent union of the States, we regard it as the highest duty of the well-wishers of the country everywhere, whatever else they may do, to at least withhold from him their support. This we intend to do.

ALEXANDER H. STEPHENS, of Ga.
CHARLES JAS. FAULKNER, of Va.
W BROOKE, of Miss.
ALEX. WHITE, of Ala.
JAMES ABERCROMBIE, of Ala.
R. TOOMBS, of Ga.
JAMES JOHNSON, of Ga.

For reasons to some extent indicated in speeches and addresses heretofore made by the undersigned, they deem it to be their duty to withhold their support from Gen. Scott as a candidate for the Presidency. If it should seem to be necessary, we will hereafter, in some form, exhibit more fully to our constituents the facts and reasons which have brought us to this determination.

M. P. GENTRY, Tenn.
C. H. WILLIAMS, Tenn.

THE FREE SOILERS IN THE FIELD.—A State Convention of the Massachusetts Free Soilers was held at Worcester on Tuesday of this week, and is described as one of the largest and most enthusiastic meetings ever held in the State. Stephen C. Phillips, of Salem, presided, assisted by a number of Vice-Presidents, chosen from among the most prominent and influential men of the party from all parts of the State. John P. Hale was among the speakers, and letters were read from J. R. Giddings, Horace Mann, Charles Sumner, S. P. Chase, and others, who were unable to be present. We give below the Resolutions passed by the Convention, which, we suppose, may be considered as the Free Soil Platform. The eleventh should satisfy Kossuth and the Germans as to the position of the party on the doctrine of non-intervention:

1. Resolved, That the Free Soil party is pre-eminently the party of the Union, and the Constitution of law and of order, of freedom and of progress—that it is opposed in its principles and sentiments, to sectionalism, secession and disunion—is equally regardful of the welfare of every part of the country—maintains the right of all men to liberty, equality, before the laws; and may, therefore, justly claim to be the true Democratic party of the Union.

2. Resolved, That the Whig and Democratic parties, by the platforms which they have recently adopted at Baltimore, have pledged themselves against the national principle of Freedom, and in favour of the sectional institutions of Slavery, have pledged themselves against free speech as well as free soil; and on the most important question now before the people, have bound themselves to a disgraceful silence, more appropriate to the subjects of despotism, than to the citizens of a Republic.

3. Resolved, That Slavery is a sin against God, and a crime against man; and that Christianity, humanity and patriotism alike demand its abolition by those who have the constitutional and legal right to abolish it.

4. Resolved, That the Federal Government ought to exercise its constitutional power to prohibit the American Slave Trade, to abolish Slavery in the District of Columbia to guarantee freedom to the Territories by the enactment of organic laws forever excluding Slavery from them, and to refuse admission into the Union to any more slave States; thus limiting and restricting Slavery to its present localities, and placing the National Government where it ought to be, openly and actively and perpetually on the side of freedom

5. Resolved, That we cordially concur in the sentiment expressed by the late Democratic National Convention, that the Federal Government is one of limited powers, derived solely from the Constitution; and the grants of power made therein ought to be strictly construed by all the departments and agents of the Government; and that it is inexpedient and dangerous to exercise doubtful constitutional powers; and, therefore,

6. Resolved, That Congress possesses no authority whatever to legislate for the rendition of fugitives from service or labour; such legislation being a dangerous encroachment upon the sovereignty of the States, a clear violation of their reserved rights, and in the form which it has assumed in the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850, repugnant to the principles of the common law, to the spirit of Christianity, and to the sentiments of the civilized world. We, therefore, demand its immediate and total repeal

7. Resolved, That any future acquisition of territory by the United States, whether by purchase, treaty, conquest, or otherwise, ought to be, and must be, upon the fundamental condition that Slavery shall be wholly and forever excluded from such territory.

8. Resolved, That a due regard to the principles and spirit of the federal constitution demands that the funds of the government should be kept separate from banking institutions—that inland and ocean postage should be reduced to the lowest possible point—that no more revenue should be raised than is required to defray the necessary expenses of the public service and to pay off the public debt, and that the power and patronage of the government should be diminished, by making all executive officers elective by the people, so far as is consistent with the prompt and efficient transaction of the public business.

9. Resolved, That the constitution vests in Congress the power to open and repair harbours, and remove obstructions from navigable rivers; and it is expedient that Congress shall exercise that power, wherever such improvements are necessary for the common defence, or for the protection of commerce with foreign nations or among the States.

10. Resolved, That the public lands of the U. States should be held as a trust, for the benefit of the people, and should be granted, in limited quantities, without charge, to actual settlers.

11. Resolved, That every nation has a right to choose its own government and arrange

tire influence of the administration would be given to the division of the State, and the admission of the Southern half to restore the equilibrium, which "the South" is said to have lost by the admission of the whole as a Free State. There is no more doubt of the realization of all these plans, if the Democrats succeed, than there was in 1844 that Mr. Tyler and his particular friends had been devoting all their talents and energies to the accomplishment of the Annexation of Texas, at the very time, in May, 1843, when John Quincy Adams, and eleven other Northern members of Congress, issued a circular, warning their constituents that such projects were on foot. It may be remembered that that circular was fiercely denied or bitterly denied by the press and public men of that day, North and South. Yet the next session a secret treaty was concluded by Tyler and his Secretaries of State, Upshur and Calhoun, for annexing Texas.

LETTER FROM GENERAL SCOTT ACCEPTING THE NOMINATION OF THE WHIG NATIONAL CONVENTION.—The *Washington Intelligencer* publishes the following letter from Gen. Scott, accepting the nomination of the Whigs:

WASHINGTON, June 24th, 1852.

SIR: I have had the honour to receive from your hands the official notice of my unanimous nomination as Whig candidate for the office of President of the United States, together with a copy of the resolutions passed by the Convention, expressing their opinions upon some of the most prominent questions of national policy.

This great distinction, conferred by a numerous, intelligent and patriotic body, representing millions of my countrymen, sinks deep into my heart. Remembering the very eminent names which were before the Convention in amicable competition with my own, I am made to to feel oppressively the weight of responsibility belonging to my new position.

Not having written a word to procure this distinction, I lost not a moment after it had been conferred in addressing a letter to one of your members, to signify what would be, at the proper time, the substance of my reply to the Convention. And I now have the honour to repeat, in a more formal manner, as the occasion justly demands, that I accept the nomination with the resolutions annexed.

The political principles and measures laid down in the resolutions are so broad, that there is little left for me to add. I therefore barely suggest in this place, that should I, by the partiality of my countrymen, be elected to the chief magistracy of the Union, I shall be ready, in my connection with Congress, to recommend or approve of measures in regard to the public domain, so as to secure an early settlement of the same, favourable to actual settlers, but consistent, nevertheless, with a due regard to the equal rights of the whole American people in the vast national inheritance. And also to recommend or approve of a single alteration in our naturalization laws, suggested by my military experience, viz.: giving to all foreigners the right of citizenship who shall faithfully serve in time of war one year on board of our public ships, or in our land forces, regular or volunteer, on their receiving an honourable discharge from the service.

In regard to the general policy of the administration, if elected, I should, of course, look among those who may approve that policy for the agents to carry it into execution. And I should seek to cultivate harmony and fraternal sentiments throughout the Whig party without attempting to reduce its members by proscription to exact uniformity to my views.

But I should at the same time be rigorous in regard to qualifications for office, retaining and appointing no one either deficient in capacity or integrity, or in devotion to Liberty, to the Constitution and the Union.

Convinced, that harmony or good will between the different quarters of our broad country is essential to the present and future interests of the Republic, and with a devotion to those interests that can know no South and no North. I should neither countenance nor tolerate any sedition, disorder, faction, or resistance to the Law or the Union, in any pretext in any part of the land. And, I should carry into the civil administration this one principle of military conduct, obedience to the Legislative and Judicial departments of Government. Each in its constitutional sphere, saving only in respect to the Legislature the possible resort to the veto power, always to be most cautiously exercised, and under the strictest restraints and necessities.

Finally—For my strict adherence to the principles of the Whig party, as expressed in the resolution of the Convention, and herein suggested with a sincere and earnest purpose to advance the greatness and happiness of the Republic, and thus to cherish and encourage the course of constitutional liberty throughout the world, avoiding every act and thought that might involve our country in an unjust or unnecessary war, or impair the faith of treaties, or discountenance all political agitation injurious to the interests of society and dangerous to the Union, I can offer no other pledge or guarantee than the known incident of a long public life, now undergoing the severest examination. Feeling myself highly fortunate in my associate on the ticket, and with a lively sense of my obligations to the Convention, and to your personal courtesies, I have the honour to remain, sir, with great esteem,

Your obedient servant,
WINFIELD SCOTT.

To Hon. J. G. CHAPMAN.

Mr. GRAHAM's reply, accepting the nomination for the Vice Presidency, is as follows:

WASHINGTON, June 24, 1852.

SIR: I am gratified to acknowledge the receipt of the communication which you did me the honour to deliver in person on yesterday, announcing my unanimous nomination as the Whig candidate for the office of Vice President of the United States, by the National Convention, which recently assembled in Baltimore, accompanied by a copy of the resolutions of the Convention upon questions of national principle and policy.

I cordially approve the declarations made by these resolutions. On matters of the most recent practical interest, they do but portray the conduct of an administration of the Government of which for near two years I have been a member. On all others they but reiterate the doctrines and recommendations held by its Chief in important public communications.

Should the people of the United States give their sanction to the nominations of your Convention, so far as I shall be invested with authority, a faithful adherence to these doctrines may be expected.

I therefore accept the distinction, so honourably tendered, with a grateful heart, but with unaffected diffidence. It is a satisfaction, however, to know that the place to which I have been nominated is but secondary, and that for the first office the Convention has proposed a citizen of tried patriotism and virtue, long and familiarly acquaintad with public affairs and public men, a safe and sagacious counsellor, who has well fulfilled every trust heretofore committed to his hands, and who has illustrated our history by eminent public services

With my thanks for the courtesy with which you have honoured me, in the execution of your office, and with the highest personal respect, I am your obedient servant,

WM. A. GRAHAM.

Hon. J. G. CHAPMAN, President
National Whig Convention.

INCREASE OF FREE BLACKS IN MARYLAND.—A report made to the House of Delegates of Maryland, by a Committee, furnishes some interesting statistics on the population of that State. By the extracts which we give below, it will be seen that the increase in the coloured race is far greater than in the white, but that this increase is confined to the free people of colour, while those in bonds have actually decreased. These are unquestionably causes at work in relation to the increase or decrease of the African race in different localities in this country which have never yet been thoroughly examined, even if they have been discovered; if they were, they would doubtless explain much which needs explanation here. We subjoin these facts, however, without attempting to elucidate them, for the benefit of those who are curious in such matters:

There are more free coloured persons in Maryland than in any other State of the Union; the number according to the census of 1860, being 74,724. In the city of Baltimore, there are 25,475. Anne Arundle contains 4602, which is the largest in any one county: the smallest number being in Allegheny county, where there are 412.

At the first census of 1790, the entire free coloured population of Maryland was but 8043, and the white population 208,649. The present white population being 410,943, it will be observed that while the free coloured population has increased *ninefold*, the white population has only *doubled*, in the last sixty years.

The entire coloured population, slave and free, of the State, in 1790, was 131,079, of which 103,084 were slaves. The entire coloured population in 1850, was 164,445, of which 98,379 were slaves. The free coloured had increased in the 60 years, 96,680, the slaves had diminished 12,668. In 1810, the slaves numbered 111,502, which was the largest number ever held at one time in Maryland.

From these figures it will be noted that the increase of the aggregate of the entire coloured population has been owing, entirely, to the increase of the free portion of it, which has been uninterruptedly going on, at almost an uniform rate, while the slaves have decreased by 12,668, since the first census.

THRICE THROUGH THE FURNACE.—A volume with the above title has just appeared, and we are requested by an esteemed friend, who speaks of it in high terms, to announce its publication. As yet we have not had time to look at it, farther than to observe that it was written soon after the passage of the Fugitive Slave Law, and as a protest against that diabolical act. Circumstances beyond the control of the author—who, we believe, is Mrs. Sophia L. Little, of Newport, a lady well and favourably known to many of our readers—have prevented its earlier publication.

It will be for sale at this office in a day or two.

HOW MR. FILLMORE SAVED THE UNION.

WITHIN a week, a letter has appeared from the acting President, Mr. Fillmore, which purports to have been written by him to the President of the late Whig Convention. It is said, however, that it was left to Mr. Babcock, in whose possession it was, to present it or not, according to the probability that Mr. Fillmore would, or would not, get the nomination. As his blundering friend Babcock did not permit him to decline receiving what was not to be offered to him, the letter is published, probably, that he may, at least, be permitted to put in his claim to be considered the Saviour of the Union. According to Mr. Fillmore, the Union is no longer in danger, and will probably never have to be saved again; so that, so far as that is concerned, Gen. Scott may hang up his feathers. The letter is below:

WASHINGTON, June 10, 1852.

To the President of the National Whig Convention.

SIR: This communication will be presented to you, and through you to the delegated wisdom of the Whig party over which you preside, by the Hon. George R. Babcock, who represents in your body the congressional district in which I reside.

I trust that I shall be pardoned by the convention for adverting briefly to the course which I have pursued, and the causes which have induced it, as a means of explaining why I have selected this time and mode of making this communication.

All must recollect that when I was so suddenly and unexpectedly called to the exalted station which I now occupy, by the death of my lamented and illustrious predecessor, there was a crisis in our public affairs full of difficulty and danger. The country was agitated by political and sectional passions and dissensions, growing out of the Slavery and territorial questions then pending, and for which Congress had as yet been able to agree upon no measure of compromise and adjustment.

The Union itself was threatened with dissolution, and patriots and statesmen looked with apprehension to the future. In that feeling I participated most profoundly. The difficulties and dangers which surrounded us were calmly but anxiously surveyed. I was oppressed by a sense of the great responsibilities that rested upon me, and sincerely distrusted my ability to sustain them in a manner satisfactory and useful to the country. But I was bound to make the attempt; and to do it with any hope of success, I felt it necessary to discard every personal consideration, and devote myself to the difficult task before me with entire singleness of heart.

To prepare and strengthen myself for this task, I endeavoured to lay aside, as far as practicable, every merely selfish consideration—to banish from my mind every local or sectional prejudice—and to remember only that I was an American citizen, and the magistrate of the American republic, bound to regard every portion and section of it with equal justice and impartiality. That I might do this the more effectually, I resolved within myself not to seek a re-election.

Thus prepared, I entered upon the discharge of my official duties, with a determination to do everthing in my power to aid in the settlement of those dangerous controversies. Fortunately for our favoured country, a majority in both houses of Congress, rising above mere party and personal considerations, nobly and patriotically devoted themselves to the great work of pacification. The constitutional advisers whom I had called to my aid, and to whose fidelity, talents, and patriotism the country is chiefly indebted for any benefit it may have received from my administration, with a unanimity and zeal worthy of every commendation, cordially gave their countenance and influence to the legislative department in perfecting and adopting those healing measures of *compromise*, to which upon their passage I felt bound, by every consideration of public duty, to give my official *approval*. These laws being enacted, my constitutional duty was equally plain, to "*take care that they were faithfully executed.*" But this I found the most painful of all my official duties. Nevertheless, I resolved to perform it, regardless of all consequences to myself: and in doing so I determined to know no North and no South—and no friends but those who sustained the constitution and laws—and no enemies but those who oppose them.

The gratifying result of this policy is before you and the country. The angry strife which for a time threatened to array State against State and brother against brother, and deluge our happy land with fraternal blood, and desolate it with fire and sword, has fortunately passed away. The surging waves of sectional agitation are calmed, and the public mind is fast settling down to its accustomed channels, and will soon renew its wonted devotion to the constitution and the Union.

Availing myself of this happy change, I had determined, when the present Congress met, to announce to the public, in my annual message, my previous resolution not to suffer my name to come before the National Convention for a nomination. I accordingly prepared a paragraph to that effect, but was finally persuaded to strike it out, lest it might have an unfavourable influence upon the then pending election in Virginia. After that had passed, I concluded to withdraw my name by a published address to the people, and prepared one accordingly; but this coming to the knowledge of some of my friends, they represented to me that my withdrawal, at that time, would not only endanger the perpetuity of those measures which I deemed so essential to the peace and welfare of the country, but would sacrifice many friends who had stood by my administration in the dark and perilous crisis through which it had so recently passed. The first was an appeal to my patriotism, and the second to my gratitude. I could resist neither, and therefore yielded to their request, and consented that my name should remain where it was, until time should show, as I presumed it would, that its further use could neither benefit them nor the cause which we all had so much at heart It was, however, distinctly understood that I could not consent to use any efforts to procure a nomination, but if one were freely and voluntarily tendered I should not be at liberty to decline it.

The embarrassing question now presents itself, who is to determine when the use of my name can no longer benefit my friends or our common cause? To assume to decide this myself, in advance of the convention, without consultation with those who have so generously sustained me, might be deemed by them unjust. To consult them is utterly impracticable, and to suffer my name to go into a *contest* for the nomination is contrary to my original intention, and utterly repugnant to my feelings. I have, therefore, without consultation with any one, felt justified in assuming the responsibility of authorizing and requesting Mr. Babcock, either before or after any vote may be taken in the convention, and whenever he shall be satisfied that I have discharge my duty to my friends and the country, to present this letter, and withdraw my name from the consideration of the convention.

I trust that my friends will appreciate the necessity which compels me to act without consulting them. I would cheerfully make any personal sacrifice for their sakes or for the good of my country, but I have nothing to ask for myself. I yielded with sincere reluctance to their entreaties to suffer my name to remain before the public as a possible candidate. I knew that it placed me in a false position. I foresaw that it would subject me to the base imputation of seeking a nomination, and of using the patronage of the government to obtain it, and then to the mortifying taunts from the same malignant source of having been defeated. But, conscious of my own integrity, I cheerfully consented to encounter all this, rather than that my friends should feel that I was indifferent either to them or the cause; and I am most happy to avail myself of this occasion to return my sincere thanks, and to express the grateful emotions of my heart, to those friends of the country who have so generously and so nobly stood by the constitution and the Union, during the perilous scenes through which we have just passed. My sincere prayer is, that their country may cherish and reward them according to their merits.

I hope and trust that my withdrawal may enable the convention to unite harmoniously upon some more deserving candidate—one who, if elected, may be more successful in winning and retaining the confidence of the party to which he is attached than I have been. Divided as we were upon my accession to the presidency on questions of vital importance, it was impossible for me to pursue a course which would satisfy all. I have not attempted it. I have sought more anxiously to do what was right than what would please; and I shall feel no disappointment at finding that my conduct has, in the estimation of a majority of the convention, rendered me an unavailable candidate. But it should at all times be a subject of felicitation to any man that he has been enabled to serve his country by sacrificing himself. This is a consequence which neither he nor his friends have any cause to regret; and I hope mine will view it in that light.

For myself, permit me to add, I have no further aspirations. I feel that I have enjoyed much more of public honours than I deserved, and I shall soon retire from this exalted station with infinitely more satisfaction than I entered upon it, and with a heart grateful for the confidence which my countrymen have reposed in me, grateful for the indulgence with which they have received my humble efforts to serve them, and anxious only that they may be better served by my successor, and that our glorious *Union* and free institutions may be perpetual.

I have the honour to be, sir, your fellow-citizen and obedient servant.

MILLARD FILLMORE.

GOVERNOR HUNT has offered one thousand dollars reward for the arrest and conviction of the parties who recently shot Mr. Wait, in the anti-rent district.

MURDER IN SOUTH CAROLINA.—We have heard a rumour of a horrid crime perpetrated by a negro at Sandy Run, Lexington district. On Sunday, a slave of Mr. Wolfe was transferred from one plantation to another against his wish. This led to a quarrel with the driver, who was killed in the encounter. The interference of the master met with the infliction of a knife wound, from which he died.—*South Carolinian.*

Miscellaneous News.

ESSEX COUNTY A. S. SOCIETY.

[From The Liberator.]

THE Annual Meeting of this Society was held in the Universalist Meeting-house at Georgetown, Saturday evening, and Sunday forenoon, afternoon, and evening, June 26th and 27th—the President, James N. Buffum, in the chair.

In the absence of the Secretary, Joseph Merrill, was chosen Secretary *pro tem.* Charles F. Hovey, Eliza J. Kenny, and Benjamin A. Stevens were chosen a committee, to nominate officers for the ensuing year; William Lloyd Garrison, C. L. Remond and John T. Page, a committee to prepare business for the meeting. A Finance Committee was chosen, consisting of B. P. Harmon and D. P. Hammond.

The meeting was addressed by William L. Garrison, Parker Pillsbury, William Jenkins, Thomas Haskell, and Benjamin A. Stevens. The latter gave a very interesting account of a visit to Savannah, Geo.

AFTERNOON SESSION.—James N. Buffum declined to be a candidate for re-election to the office of President the ensuing year. On motion, it was unanimously voted, that the thanks of this Society are due to Mr. Buffum, for his impartial decisions, his unflinching fidelity and untiring zeal in behalf of the interests of this Society, while acting as its President.

The Committee on nominations reported the following list of names for the officers of the Society for the ensuing year, which was adopted:

President.—CHARLES L. REMOND, of Salem.

Vice Presidents.—Eliza J. Kenny, Salem; Thomas T. Stone, Salem; Warren Low, Essex; Benjamin A. Stevens, Lawrence; Nathan Webster, Haverhill; E. Jenkins, Andover; Moses Wright, Georgetown.

Cor. Secretary.—Geo. W. Putnam, Lynn.

Recording Secretary.—Joseph Merrill, Danvers.

Treasurer.—Eliza J. Kenny, Salem.

Auditor.—Jesse P. Harriman, Danvers.

Executive Committee.—Abner Sanger, Danvers; Gertrude Barrett, do.; Eli Burnham, do.; John Bailey, Lynn; Theodore Elliott, Georgetown; Jas. Babcock, Salem; Joseph H. Putnam, do.

The following resolutions were offered by Wm. L. Garrison, Chairman of the Business Committee:

1. Resolved, That in the long, dark record of human depravity, embracing all climes and all ages, nothing is to be found comparable to the guilt of this nation in enslaving one sixth portion of its entire population; because, since the world was made, no other nation has enjoyed such light, or made such lofty professions of regard for the cause of liberty and the rights of man.

2. Resolved, That as it is a 'self-evident' truth, that all men are created equal, and endowed by their Creator with an inalienable right to liberty; it is also self-evident, that they who deny that equality, and trample upon that right, are to be classed among the worst of tyrants, and denounced as the enemies of mankind.

3. Resolved, That in every slave on the American soil, we see 'a man and a brother'—in every slaveholder, a man-stealer—in every apologist for Slavery, one who is recreant to the instinct of his own nature, and disregardful of all the principles of justice and humanity.

4. Resolved, That as there is no crime equal in atrocity to the act of turning a human being into a piece of property, it follows that if, as the great majority of the clergy of this country maintain, Slavery is sanctioned by the Bible, then the Bible is the most pernicious volume in the universe, and those religious interpreters are doing what in them lies to cover it with opprobrium. Nevertheless,

5. Resolved, That neither slaveholders nor their defenders believe their declarations, as to this alleged sanction, is clearly established by the fact, that they prohibit the circulation of the Bible among the slave population, and make it a heinous offence to teach their slaves to read its 'inspired' teachings.

6. Resolved, That nowhere is the portraiture of this bloody and oppressive nation so correctly drawn—nowhere are its hypocrisies, pollutions and crimes so vividly portrayed—nowhere is it so strongly rebuked, so faithfully warned, so boldly arraigned, or so fearfully condemned—as in the pages of that volume which it professes to regard as the Word of God.

7. Resolved, That since the conspiracy of the Jewish Chief Priests, Scribes and Pharisees, for the crucifixion of Jesus, and the extirpation of Christianity, the world has witnessed no conclaves of fallen spirits more profligate in principle, more desperate in purpose, more lost to shame, more stained with blood or steeped in pollution, than the recent National Whig and Democratic Conventions at Baltimore; and that, in the 'platforms' mutually adopted by them as the test of party fidelity and the bond of union, the acme of human guilt is attained—seeing that all discussion of the Slavery question, whether in Congress or out of it, 'whenever, wherever, or however the attempt may be made,' is henceforth to be frowned upon, and, if possible, suppressed, as 'dangerous to our peace'—that a new and fearful impetus has been given to the extension and perpetuity of that system which is 'the sum of all villinies'—and that a full, hearty, and everlasting endorsement of the Fugitive Slave Law is made, whereby those acts of mercy to the suffering and outraged, which Christ has set forth as the test of character and the condition of salvation, in the day of judgment, are branded and punished as crimes.

8. Resolved, That in Gen. Franklin Pierce, the Presidential candidate of the Democratic party, we recognise one whose professions of Democracy are insulting to the common sense of mankind, and in the highest degree impudent and profligate; whose career, whether in private or in public, 'whether in Congress or out of it,' has been marked by an unbroken series of acts, unsurpassed in servility to the Slave Power, hostile to every attempt to give succour and redemption to the millions in bondage, as gratuitous in their performance as they were villanous; and who, in his recent letter of acceptance of his nomination, puts the seal to his eternal condemnation when he says, 'I accept the nomination upon the platform adopted by the Convention, not because this is expected of me as a candidate, but because the principles embraced in it command the approbation of my judgment, and with that I believe I can truly say, there has been no word or act in my life in conflict with them.'

9. Resolved, That in Gen. Winfield Scott, the Whig candidate for the Presidency, we are presented with a military chieftain, whose laurels are stained with blood, and were gathered in a war most wantonly aggressive, the most wicked on record in view of its origin and design, and to the dismemberment of an empire solely for the purpose of giving strength and permanence to the Slave Power; and who heartily supports all these atrocious compromises, including the Fugitive Slave Law, which are now declared to be the test of loyalty to the Government, and essential to the preservation of the Union.

10. Resolved, therefore, That in voting for either of the Presidential candidates, full sanction is given to slaveholding, slave hunting, and a war of aggression—and sentence of condemnation passed against every effort to break every yoke, and to let the oppressed go free; hence, every voter for such men forfeits all claim to the title of Christian, and is utterly defective in his morality.

11. Resolved, That in the scornful and utter rejection of the claims of DANIEL WEBSTER, the great Northern Apostate, for the Presidency of the United States, by the entire body of Southern delegates in the great Whig Convention at Baltimore—he not having received a single vote from them during the whole fifty-three ballottings—we see an instructive and cheering fulfillment of the scriptural declaration, that 'the expectations of the wicked shall perish,' and 'he that, being often reproved, and hardeneth his heart, shall suddenly be destroyed, and that without remedy.'

12. Resolved, That in the language or another, 'never was wickedness more disgracefully defeated—never were the instruments of Divine Justice more fitly chosen.'

13. Resolved, That 'it is no unholy triumph that swells our hearts in view of such an event as this defeat of Daniel Webster, but the joyful accepting of the truth that Congress is not omnipotent to dethrone the God of heaven and earth, and that He still maketh the wrath of man to praise Him.'

Parker Pillsbury offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That in order to render the 'COMPROMISES' of a late Congress, a full and perfect manifestation of total depravity, there should only have been added to them a proposition or measure to drag the free coloured people of the United States from their native land, and colonize them on the barbarous and pestilential coast of Africa.

Resolved, That this omission seems likely to be atoned for, by the zeal and interest which that subject is now exciting, in Congress and in many of the separate States, as well as in the more private departments of society—and we feel called upon to renew our warfare upon so infamous a device of Slavery to prolong its power—and to expose its hypocrisy and iniquity to the world; and thus to save a large portion of our countrymen from an exile and banishment as cruel and atrocious almost as Slavery itself.

These resolutions were discussed in a very able manner by C. L. Remond, Parker Pillsbury, J. P. Harriman, James N. Buffum, John M. Spear, and W. L. Garrison.

EVENING SESSION.—This session of the Society was one of great interest. Addresses were made by G. F. Chever, J. N. Buffum, John I. Innis, Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Chas. Lenox Remond, Jesse P. Harriman, and Parker Pillsbury.

On motion of John T. Page, it was voted, that the next Quarterly Meeting of this Society be held at Lawrence, on Saturday and Sunday, the 26th and 27th of September.

On motion of Moses Wright, it was

Voted, That we present our thanks to the proprietors of this house, that they have, through their committee, unhesitatingly granted its use to us on this occasion; an act in which their liberality nobly contrasts with the limited and intolerant spirit which governs both the other religious bodies in this place.

This meeting was one of uncommon interest. Throughout it was evident to all present, that our cause is steadily advancing. No power can withstand the mighty onslaught of the invincible lovers of liberty. The day will be ours, the victory is sure; for who can successfully oppose the will of the living God?

CHARLES LENOX REMOND, *President.*
JOSEPH MERRILL, *Secretary.*

TERRIBLE ACCIDENT AT STATEN ISLAND, ON THE 5TH INST.

Below we give, from a report in the *Times*, the particulars of one of those calamities so common here, and which distinguish this city as, above all others in the world, reckless of human life, and regardless of human suffering. For this dreadful event, one man, Mr. Vanderbilt, is as much responsible as though he had, in cold blood, murdered these victims of his reckless carelessness, and is as much deserving of the measure of justice which society reserves for those who are its worst and most dreaded scourges. But there is no public opinion which will demand such a retribution. The accident will be talked of for a week, and then will be forgotten till another as calamitous, within a few months, shall remind the people that such things have occurred before. The press that influences the public opinion hardly ventures to hint of blame, or to suggest a correction:

Accident at Staten Island—Dreadful Loss of Life—Twelve Bodies Found—A number of persons missing.

About 4 o'clock on Monday afternoon, a horrible accident occurred at Vanderbilt's Landing, Staten Island, by which many persons were drowned. Twelve bodies have already been recovered, and many persons are missing, whom it is feared have perished. The following are the particulars:

The end of the wharf is provided with a bridge, supparted by two chains, which could be raised or lowered, so that the boats could land their passengers at any state of the tide. Upon this bridge a large number of persons had crowded, who were anxious to obtain a passage to the City. The steamer *Hunchback* had on board about fifteen hundred passengers. Those on the boat were anxious to get ashore, and those on the wharf pushed forward towards the boat. The opposing crowds met on the draw-bridge, and the weight was so great as to break the chains, and more than two hundred persons were precipitated into the water—a distance of fifteen feet.

The pit was completely filled up with the bodies piled upon each other—men, women, and children—all struggling for life, and tortured by the weight resting upon their bodies or limbs. The shrieks and groans from the victims below were hardly more appalling than that which came from the bosoms of parents and brothers, and sisters and children on the wharf, agonized with doubt lest some of their own circle were among the perishing.

The small boats in the neighbourhood were immediately manned, and put off to the rescue of those in the water. The cries of the women and children could be heard at a great distance, and a large crowd of persons, anxious to assist, was soon in attendance. By their exertions, the greater part of those in the water were taken out alive, but the loss of life is shocking.

Below we give the names of all the dead bodies recovered, upon which inquests were held by Coroner Randolph at Staten Island, and Coroner Ives in this City. The bodies grappled up were all conveyed to houses in the vicinity, except one, which was brought to this City. Annexed are the names of the dead on which Coroner Randolph held inquisitions:

Evelyn Wesensus, residence No. 114 West Broadway.
Charlotte Banto, Walker street, New York.
Sarah Jane Gwilliam, aged 3 years, Philadelphia.
Jane Gwillim, the mother, Philadelphia.
Margaret Frieschs, No. 206 Walker street, New York.
Catherine McName, Brooklyn.
Elizabeth Ketson, Brooklyn.
Jane Holens, Green Point.
Elizabeth Colclough, Green Point.
Mary S. Lloyd, Walker street, New York.
James W. Robinson, No. 157 Cherry street, New York.

The verdict in each case was rendered by the Jury as being the result of pure accident, which, however, is not the opinion of many, who believe that the bridge was not properly secured by a float and stays beneath it. The only support was the strength of two iron chains. We give the names of other residents of this City who are missing.

A young man named Alexander H. Hackett, employed at the Oak Hall clothing store in Fulton street, is said to have gone to the island on board of the above steamer, and has not since been heard from. The parents of this young man were at the landing all day yesterday, weeping for the loss of their son. The son of John Earle, belonging to the Custom House, is also among the missing.

A gentleman named Carter, residing in Virginia, was known to have been on the boat, and, not having been heard of since Monday morning, it is feared he is lost.

A lad by the name of Getney, residing in Troy, N. Y., is among the missing. Up to last evening, nothing had been heard of him.

A gentleman named Siminson, together with his son, had a very narrow escape from drowning. They were both precipitated into the water, and, in the fall, the child had his teeth knocked out, and otherwise injured his face, which rendered him perfectly insensible. When rescued from his perilous situation, he was exhausted. Several others are missing; and up to a late hour last night, a large number of men were still engaged with their grapples, in search of the bodies of others who are supposed to have been drowned.

In the afternoon, Coroner Ives, of this City, held an inquest, at the foot of Whitehall street, on the body of a lady named Charlotte Fisher, and the following testimony was taken:

Patrick O. Hanlon, sworn, deposed as follows—I reside at No. 161 Fulton-street, Brooklyn; I was at Staten Island on the 5th inst., and about 3 o'clock, P. M., as I was returning, and had reached Vanderbilt's Landing, the draw-bridge was densely thronged, and gave way, precipitating the deceased and others into the water; I think the chains gave way, which was the only support of the bridge; I did not see her in the water, nor did I see her until she was placed on the deck of the ferry-boat, when I recognised the body to be that of Mrs. Fisher, of Brooklyn; she was then alive; when I saw her she was wet through, and died while coming to New York.

In order to clearly identify the body of deceased, another witness was called and testified as follows:

John Thonger, residing at No. 147 Jay-street, Brooklyn, was sworn, and says: I have been acquainted with the deceased about twelve months. She is a widow lady, and has no family. I believe the body before me to be that of Charlotte Fisher. Further, deponent saith not.

The Jury rendered a verdict "That the deceased came to her death by suffocation, consequent upon having fallen into the water at Vanderbilt's Landing, at Staten Island, on the 5th inst."

Another reporter gives the following particulars:

A melancholy accident occurred at Vanderbilt's Landing, Clifton, Staten Island, on the 5th July. On Monday afternoon, at 4 o'clock, as the steamboat *Hunchback* came from the City to land at Vanderbilt's Landing, the ferry bridge gave way, precipitating about 50 or 60 persons in the river, men, women and children, and a number were drowned. A number were saved by the bystanders on the dock. Twelve bodies had been recovered up to 12 o'clock on Monday night. The following are the names of the persons as far as could be ascertained: Eliza Colclough, aged 28 years, residing at Green Point, L. I.; Mrs. Jane Holens, of Green Point, L. I., aged 20—had been married but a short time; Mrs. Margaret Freelich, of Germany, residing at No. 206 Walker-street; Charlotte Benta, aged 10 years, residing at No. 206 Walker-street; Joseph William Robinson, aged 5 years, residing at No. 157 Cherry-street; Mrs. Elizabeth, wife of John Ritsen, residing corner of Smith and Warren-streets, Brooklyn, aged 19 years—lately married; Catharine McNamee, sister to Mrs Ritsen, aged 15 years, residing in Warren street, near Columbia, Brooklyn; Mary Eleanor Lloyd, daughter of Henry Lloyd, residing at 226 Tenth avenue, aged 4 months; a woman, supposed to be Mrs. Guilliam, of Philadelphia, aged 35 years; the body of a woman was taken from the dock, she was about 40 years of age, dressed in a brown De Laine frock, had a full set of false teeth in the upper jaw; also the body of a female child, aged about 2 years. A lady that was taken from the water died on board of the steamboat *Hunchback*, on her passage to the city. Coroner Randolph held an inquest on the bodies, and the Jury returned a verdict of drowning by the ferry bridge giving away.

The bodies of Mrs. Jane Gwilliam and her daughter Sarah Jane, of Philadelphia, were recognised on Tuesday morning. This lady and her daughter left Philadelphia on Sunday last to visit some friends residing in this City.

A correspondent, who was present, makes the following comments on this tragical affair:

Being an eye witness of the fatal tragedy that took place at Vanderbilt's dock, at Staten Island, on the afternoon of the 5th, whereby seventeen men, women, and children, were almost instantly drowned, I think if my duty to speak out. The whole accident occurred owing to a most criminal neglect. The people were let in through the gate on to the bridge, and had nowhere else to stand. The bridge was densely crowded, with men, women, and children. The bridge gave way on one side, and precipitated full one hundred and fifty persons a distance of six feet to the water, which was about eight feet deep. They fell as it were into a well. Those under had no chance, and the wonder is that so many were saved. If Captain Vanderbuilt had gone to the expense of ten dollars when the bridge was built, to have put two sticks of timber underneath, for the bridge to fall on, at a distance of some two or three feet, this whole loss of lives might have been saved. Last year a similar accident happened on the People's Ferry, when I was on their bridge. The chains that supported it gave way, when the bridge was equally crowded, but, in consequence of the timber being placed as a support, not the slightest injury occurred to any one.

THE COLONISATION SCHEME IN EMBRYO.—The flesh-mongers' infernal scheme of peopling pestilential Africa with the offscourings of their diabolical institution is rapidly hastening to its consummation. We advise the North to watch well its course. However specious the cry of "benevolence—kindness to the black," which will accompany the discussion of this measure, it may be safely inferred there is deep iniquity beneath the surface of the professed philanthropy. The history of this matter is as follows:

On the 4th inst., Mr. Stanly, of North Carolina, obtained leave in the House of Representatives to introduce a bill, authorising the Secretary of the Treasury to deposite with the several States, the fourth instalment of the deposites of the public money, directed to be so used by the act of June 23, 1836, for the purposes and on the conditions specified in the bill. The purport of the bill did not appear from the reports published at the time, but from the abstract of the bill we give below it will be seen that the object of it is to appropriate the interest on the said amount of the public money to the "*colonisation and education*" of the free people of colour in the several States, under the direction of their respective State governments, to the amount of their several proportions of the said deposit. The bill was referred to the Committee of Ways and Means, who have yet, as far as we have observed, made no report.

Section 1st provides that the Secretary of the Treasury be authorized to deposite, with those States that received the previous instalments, the fourth instalment of the deposites of public money, directed to be made with said States, under the provisions of the 13th section of the act approved the 23d of June, 1836, in sums to which each State was entitled respectively, amounting in the aggregate the enormous sum of *nine millions three hundred and sixty-seven thousand two hundred and fourteen dollars and ninety-eight cents!*

Section 2d provides that, for carrying out the foregoing provision for the object contemplated, the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to prepare a certificate of stock for each State, to be deposited with it, signed by said Secretary, and countersigned by the Register of the Treasury, bearing an interest of five per centum per annum, payable half yearly.

Section 3d gives the purpose of the bill and the deposite, which is, that the said States shall "transport to Liberia in Africa, the free people of colour within said States respectively, and to provide for and to educate said people, as each State entitled to the stock may direct. And when any State aforesaid, by an act for that purpose, shall agree to accept the deposite and appropriate the interest accruing thereon for the purposes aforesaid, or either of them, the said Secretary of the Treasury, on being notified thereof by any authenticated copy of the act, shall deliver to the Governor of said State so accepting said deposite, the certificate of stock prepared for said State, in manner aforesaid, or to such other officer as the State may designate."

Section 4th enacts that when a State that accepts the said stock shall thereafter decline or omit to appropriate and expend the interest, "according to the true intent and meaning of this act," the interest on said stock so deposited with that State shall cease so long as the State shall thus decline or omit to carry this act into effect.

Section 5th provides that the principle of said stock is not to be paid without the express direction of Congress.

Section 6th contracts that when said States shall have removed all such free persons of colour residing in their respective borders, as are mentioned, then the balance of the money to which they are entitled shall be appropriated by said States to the education of the poor, or to internal improvements within their respective borders, as to each State shall seem right and proper.

At first glance, several of these provisions seem fair and humane, but a closer reading, confirmed by the interpretation given to some portions of the Fugitive Slave Law—induce us to believe that the rights and liberties of the coloured race being in question, its specious language may become, in part the means of great wrong. Free Soilers and Abolitionists should have nothing to do with this scheme, for not until we are ready to admit the *right* of one race to despoil another of its birth-place and its freedom, can we sanction any legislation tending to provide the way, however mild, in which the injury shall be inflicted.—*Commonwealth.*

—VIRGINIA FREEDOM ILLUSTRATED.—We have already published, we believe, a short account of the arrest and imprisonment in Lee County, Virginia, of Charles Terry, of Connecticut, upon a charge of inciting two slaves to escape from their master. He was arrested on the 19th of April and put in Scott County jail (that of Lee County not being thought safe), where he was kept until the 17th of May, when he was taken out and examined before five Justices. Stephen N. Taylor, of Jonesville, where the examination took place, has sent us an account of it. Mr. Taylor was himself taken up in the winter of 1851, and after being imprisoned sixteen days, tried and acquitted upon a charge of preaching Anti-Slavery doctrine and circulating Anti-Slavery documents. He very naturally feels an earnest sympathy for Terry, and we presume his statement of the case may be relied upon as correct. We infer from his letter that he (Taylor) is a preacher of the gospel.

Charles Terry, it appears, is a clock-maker by trade. The man at whose instigation he was arrested, was Timothy Lisk, whom Mr. Taylor pronounces "a notorious liar;"—probably he belongs to that low class of white men who are ever ready to earn the favour of the slaveholders by the basest means. This Lisk testified that he went with the prisoner into widow Davenport's tavern-kitchen; that the prisoner entered into conversation with the negroes; that witness went to bed and left him, and that he subsequently got up and went to the head of the stairs and listened, when he heard the prisoner telling the negroes that they had better leave and go to Ohio with him, where they should be free and have land and horses—he had more money than any one else in town, and that he (the prisoner) would see them safe there. Afterwards the prisoner, being ill, sent for a doctor, and actually asked the doctor if he was an Abolitionist; and when the latter answered in the negative, the prisonor then inquired how he liked the Abolitionist! Dreadful!

Samuel Martin testified, that on the day Terry was arrested he "*suspicioned*" him from his appearance, and being a merchant, actually removed his books and money to his sleeping apartment and armed himself with pitchforks!

Terry denies that he said one word to the negroes, and a witness named Pierce Rutherford testified that Lisk had told him only the day before Terry's arrest that he (Lisk) could not understand *what* the prisoner said to the slaves. James Arnold and James Connor testified that Lisk had made the same statement to them, thus flatly contradicting his own testimony.

On such evidence as this Terry was bound over for trial at the County Court to be held on the second Monday in September.

This case illustrates the freedom which Northern men are permitted to enjoy in the Old Dominion, and shows us the value of our glorious Union! Will the North always endure in silence such outrages at the hands of the slave-breeders and slave-traders of Virginia.—*Pa. Freeman.*

—DRAYTON AND SAYRES.—'Howard' writes us in behalf of these unfortunate victims of the Slave Power, who have been so long imprisoned in

Miscellaneous Department.

ANOTHER 'LETTER FROM UNDER' THE TROPICS.

[By N. P. Willis, in the *Home Journal*.]

Martinique, April. 1852.

Dear Morris: I cannot but think it a good feature of a religion, that the service attracts idlers to its church every day—whatever be the immediate motive of their curiosity. Good thoughts are apt to drop upon a man, from sacred roofs; and, without being a Catholic, one may have so put his heart within reach of gentler and better influences, by daily reverie amid impressive architecture and ceremonials, as to owe a great deal to Catholic churches The sight of people praying sincerely is very moving: and the living picture seldom wanting in any dome or cathedral, is some poor wretch who has come in from a world without pity, and is finding relief and consolation where there is hope and mercy.

The church, this morning (into which I had strolled, with an hour to spare), was a delightful shelter from the glare of the sun, our usual sight-seeing ramble having extended far into a southern forenoon—nine o'clock. There was no service, except a priest in every confessional box, and six or seven young girls, at each one, waiting with sins to disburthen. A young negro priest was busy about the altar, arranging its silver furniture and dropping to his knee whenever he passed before the image of the Virgin, and the only sound that interrupted the shuffle of his slippers was the whir of the wings of a flock of swallows, a dozen or more of them having built their nests between the holy pictures and the walls of the chancel. I found a seat for my tired limbs—(the dim light and lofty roof an easy-chair for my timid mind—and, for an hour, enjoyed at least the luxury of the spot.

Several had come in and told their beads while I sat there, and the turbaned heads had, one after another, been laid against the brass plate (the other side of whose secret-keeping holes were at the priest's ear in the confessional box), and, when I rose to go, I was almost alone. One negro woman was the only worshipper I saw—a hideous-looking object, she seemed at first—who had apparently just ventured to creep within the threshold, and setting down the wooden tray with which she had brought in a load for the market, had sunk into a heap of rags and misery upon her knees. I was passing her, when the expression of her face arrested my attention—complete exhaustion and suffering, softened with an inexpressible sincerity of imploringness. She prayed as if she felt, that, if there were a God in heaven, she would then be heard—that she had suffered enough, and was poor enough, and old and weary enough, to make it sure—and she was waiting to be answered. I stepped over the ashy white soles of her skinny and dusty black feet turned up on the edges of her rags, and, as I rounded the post of the porch near which she knelt, dropped a piece of money into the dirty cloth she had laid aside upon the floor, the cushion which softened the weight of her tray upon her head. To her, it was an answer to prayer. there is little doubt—and, if the angels did not do it (perhaps they did, by prompting me), she probably believed they did; and there are illusions, if this were one, which it is better should be believed in.

We were at the Sunday morning mass, at this same church, and, as it is the season of Lent, it was unusually thronged. We saw, we were assured, the choicest of the female society of the place—and female, almost to a man, the congregation was. The Creole ladies were in unexceptionable French toilette—charming bonnets of the newest Parisian fashion, beautifully worn as well as beautifully chosen—and there was no look of the Tropics about them except in their complexions. A sallowness, of the hue of handled ivory (which I am growing to think rather elegant than otherwise), is on the youngest and healthiest cheek, and of roses there are none. But we were charmed with one thing, which delights the traveller wherever the French are found—the affectionate and caressing respect with which the elderly ladies of the crowd were treated by their younger friends and acquaintances. As the dispersing congregation poured out of church, the centres of the groups were the grey-haired matrons (who, by the way, were dressed with a care and an elegant propriety that expressed their social value)—and who were beset, and questioned, and kissed, as if, to be loved and admired, it were only necessary to be old. The manners of these gray-haired favourites were most winning, I thought—their dignity and ease being mingled with a kind of condescending playfulness and gayety that must make the young people at home in their company, and which showed besides, how completely restraint was removed, and how sincere and natural were the exchanges of compliments and kind words. Life brightens to the end, in this way, as the sun sets.

But the Sunday mass, we have been told, was the great opportunity to see the holiday costumes and demeanour of the middle and lower classes of the island—and a show of no small magnificence it was. The French negress gives up her wool, as impracticable of coiffure; but she makes up for her disowned peculiarity as a thunder-cloud is replaced by rainbow. Her Madras turban is not only of every colour that can be woven, but the squares in it are painted with brighter colours, renewed after every washing. In any street of St. Pierre on a week day you may see the black beauty with pots and paint brush, preparing her bright kerchief for Sunday wear. You can have no idea of the effect of a thousand of these gorgeous heads coming down the steps of a cathedral. It was like a Trenton Falls of tulips and boquets—a slow cascade of negresses crowned with rainbows—the black faces giving the relief of velvet under flowers. A true copy of a cathedral with such a congregation issuing from it, would astonish even Williams and Stevens' show-window.

The remainder of the dress—the fashion of which they adhere to with singular universality—is primitively simple. It is a chemise and a petticoat—nothing else. The short sleeves of the white undergarments hang very loosely about the shoulders, and as it is not shaped at all to the form, there seems to be no particular design of concealing the bust. either by young or old. As to figure, indeed, they have evidently no idea of any differences of beauty in it, nor of any embellishments for it, or display of it, except by the colours in which it is draped. The petticoat is a mere skirt of brilliant dyes, tied over the chemise at the waist, and they have a very unbecoming fashion of wearing it so long that it cannot be loosed upon the ground, but must be caught up and hitched at the side. It, consequently, clings ungracefully close behind, showing sometimes, to be sure, a well-turned and polished calf of a black leg, but otherwise quite spoiling the beauty of these stately Cleopatras. I have not seen a stocking on one of them, since I have been here, and they are usually barefooted—but it seems to be the height of elegance, with here and there a dressy one, to wear gentlemen's walking-pumps of patent leather, in which the skin sets like a neat black stocking. The gold ornaments are of such monstrous massiveness and quantity as to be the feature which catches the eye, however. I am told that a girl usually carries her whole fortune in them, and, to her ebony complexion, the rich yellow of the gold is certainly very embellishing.

A walk through the streets of St. Pierre on Sunday afternoon is not very much what a walk through the streets of New York would be, at the same hour. The whole population are seated outside—the white people in chairs around the doors, the black people in the middle of the street, squat on the pavement—and all in costumes of the gayest colours. The climate, which, at the North, is simply air to breath. here furnishes several things beside, viz.: a drawing-room with a blue roof, happiness when idle, and several articles of dress. A house for the negro is only a place to sleep and be sick in. He and his family reside in the open air; and, on a holiday evening, every corner you turn seems to present you with an immense game of "hunt the slipper," played by the opposite neighbours on the pavement between their houses. I have described to you the bright rivulet in the middle of every street, and the cleanliness of every one of them, from there being no vehicles and seldom a horse passing—and this makes the front of every dwelling like a court-yard, and it is so used. The naked children sit in the water, or run about like a litter of puppies; the men and women lounge on the flat stones, and smoke, and look on; the old folks lean against the wall, happy in their cigars; the young girls coquet in their finery, straightening up and taking an attitude as the stranger comes along; nobody looks "bored," nobody particularly grave, everybody content, and half the world, at least, very merry.

Through all this, it is very amusing for a foreigner to stroll, and, to me, it is a succession of *tableaux vivants*, of which I never tire. One picks his way through seated neighbourhoods of people, and around groups, making the circuit of a fat beauty and her dress, or stepping over a child or its grandmother, and, really, sees more of the physiognomy of the people and their habits in half an hour, than elsewhere in a month. "Interior life"—of which the stranger may see nothing in other cities, is here all open to him. *Le diable boiteux*, who looked down through the roofs, could scarce see more.

An instance of negro politeness which we fell in with, the other evening, may amuse you. My friend and I were sauntering slowly toward the lovely suburbs of the town, when I found myself compelled to go around a fat negress, very gaily dressed, who sat on the pavement in the street, and was indolently dividing an orange. The segments of the fruit looked so ripe and tempting that I ventured to put thumb and finger toward one of them. and ask for it with a *s'il vous plait*. She nodded her chin quite down into her black bosom as she handed the orange up to me, but, seeing Mr. G. at the next moment. she insisted on my taking the rest of the fruit and sharing it with my friend. With a broad smile of good nature that had not a shadow of servility or obsequiousness in it, she waved her fat hand with an adieu, and we went on our way, enriched with a new acquaintance I have met her once since, and taken off my hat, with quite as much pleasure as a bow usually gives—and the world would be happier. I think, if this were a specimen of its every-day intercourse.

A little farther on, in the same walk, we passed a garden in which there was a flowering tree, of a beauty quite new to us. Its green foliage was very full, and the tree was about as tall as the common tulip tree—but it looked precisely as if a soft damp snow had fallen in the night and laden down its branches with as much as they could bear. The rich white flowers lay cupped in the middle of each spreading branch—a large lap-full in every clustre. We learned afterwards that this was the *frangipane*—and it seemed an exotic, for we in vain inquired its name, of two very intelligent-looking gentlemen who were passing at the moment, but of whose politeness I wished to speak, by the way, as illustrating the manners of the better class of white inhabitants. They raised their hats very courteously at my abrupt question, stopped, and entered into conversation, and parted from us, after five minutes' discourse upon the trees and plants of the island, with the civility of friends or acquaintances. As we were bound to a public promenade, we passed these same gentlemen again, seated on one of the stone benches, and they took off their hats to us again with the same genial courtesy and a polite phrase of recognition. This is not much, perhaps, but as a feature of national manners, I think it very admirable. The stranger is made to feel at home by such kindness, and there is an out-door hospitality in it, which, for the pleasure it gives, leaves "letters of introduction" far behind.

Poor people, here, live in the city—not in the suburbs; and a walk out of town is, consequently, a pleasanter thing than where the suburbs are shanties and pig-styes (a three-mile gauntlet of vile smells, as it is at New York). Gardens and villas commence immediately at the ends of the streets, and, to an American eye, at least, there are few objects, moving or stationary, even for the first mile out of St. Piere on the north, that are not new and picturesque. So it seemed to us. A little altar, at the side of the road, had one poor candle burning before its rude image of the virgin, and a negro knelt praying before it. The ladies sat smoking their cigars under the porticoes. Yoked together by the horns, and with their noses crowded down to the dust, the poor oxen, that could not turn their heads, toiled past with their monstrous loads, and gave us a side glance out of their great mournful eyes. A new volcano, lately broken out in the side of the mountain beyond (and in which the inhabitants rejoice, as a vent for what might otherwise have been an earthquake), sent up its black column of smoke to the sky. Charming waterfalls (sluices from the sides of the massive aqueducts), poured over precipices that were not born to the honour of so white a veil. Soldiers off duty were strolling over the hills in their bright uniforms. Naked black children were playing everywhere on the road, stamped with daguerreotypes of the white dusted stones they had sat down upon. Flowers of the most brilliant dyes grew wild on all sides. The air was an unmingled deliciousness to breathe, and everybody's counte nance indolently and contentedly expressed it. Take me such a walk in your temperate zone, my dear Morris!

And with thus getting the better of you, I will close this letter. Yours ever,

N. P. W.

ARCHBISHOP WHATELY'S BOOK OF SYNONYMS.

Accuracy of language is one of the things which, in ordinary speech and writing, is but indifferently observed. The reason, perhaps, is to be sought, not in any general indifference to correctness or precision, but rather in the want of some recognised authority. some specific rules or principles, to which the use of words apparently synonymous, yet of slightly different signification, might be distinctly and easily referred. It is in regard to the finer shades of meaning, the subtler touches of expression, the application of words and phrases where the strictest exactness and perspicuity are required, that an ordinary English style is apt to become loose and shadowy; and it is precisely here that we are entitled to expect the severest, chastest form of utterance. Coleridge used to complain of a general confounding of the word "notion" with "idea," and was often at great pains to point out the distinction between the two, as also between many other words similarly misused. Archdeacon Hare, too, has remarked upon the common misapplication of such words as "education" for "instruction" "government" for "administration," "the church" for "the priesthood" or "ministry;" and indeed holds that such a confounding of terms leads to serious practical misunderstandings and confusions.* Any one, upon reflection, will perceive that in the common use of these and numberless other words, there is often a signal lack of clearness and precision, and will hardly fail to notice that the error proceeds from a want of due attention to the nice and peculiar meanings of words, which are vaguely presumed to have the same signification.

As a help to those who may wish to attain a somewhat more than common correctness of style and language, Archbishop Whately has recently published a small work on *English Synonyms*;† and the rapidity with which the first edition has been disposed of leads us to infer that the public is to some extent prepared to take an interest in the subject. The second edition, "revised and enlarged," is now before us, and it is thought that a brief glance at its contents may not be unacceptable to some of our present readers.

The word "synonym," as the archbishop observes, is, in strict reality, a misnomer. "Literally, it implies an exact coincidence of meaning in two or more words, in which case there would be no room for discussion; but it is generally applied to words which would be more correctly termed *pseudo*-synonyms—that is, words having a shade of difference, yet with a sufficient resemblance of meaning to make them liable to be confounded. And it is in the number and variety of these that, as the Abbe Girard well remarks, the richness of a language consists. To have two or more words with exactly the same sense, is no proof of copiousness, but simply an inconvenience. A house would not be called well furnished from its having a larger number of chairs and tables of one kind than were needed, but from its having a separate article for each distinct use. The more power we have of discriminating the nicer shades of meaning, the greater facility we possess of giving force and precision to our expressions. Our own language possesses great advantages in this respect; for being partly derived from the Teutonic, and partly from the Latin, we have a large number of duplicates from the two sources, which are, for the most part, though not universally, slightly varied in their meaning.

"These slight variations of meaning," he proceeds, "add to the copiousness of the English language, by affording words of more or less familiarity, and of greater and less force. This may easily be understood, if we consider that the branch of the Teutonic, spoken in England during the Anglo Saxon period, never became extinct, but that three fourths of the English language at present consists of words altered or derived from that ancient dialect; that these words usually express the most familiar ideas—such as *man, house, land*, &c.; and that the French terms gradually introduced, being those of a more highly civilized people, were adapted to express the more refined ideas. This is true even of physical objects; thus, for instance, most of the names of the animals used for food are still Teutonic—such as *ox, sheep, swine*, &c. The Anglo Saxons, like the modern Germans had no objection to say *ox-flesh, sheep-flesh, swine's-flesh*; but the Norman conquerors, introducing a more refined cookery, introduced with it French words for the flesh of the animal; hence we have *beef, mutton, pork*, &c."

It has not been the author's design to notice *all* the synonyms in the language—that as he remarks, would be an almost endless undertaking; "but merely, after excluding technical terms, and words which do exactly coincide, to select a few of those groups of words which are in most frequent use, and are most liable to be confounded." His purpose, perhaps, will be more distinctly shown, if we add a few more sentences from the preface.

"Many persons," says he, "imagine that two words must either coincide precisely in their meaning, so as to be, in the primary and strict sense of the word, 'synonymous,' or else stand for two (more or less) distinct *things*. Indeed, it would often be regarded as almost a truism to assert this; but those who maintain such an opinion overlook the fact, that two words, without exactly coinciding in sense, may nevertheless relate to one and the same thing, regarded in *two different points of view*. An illustration of this is afforded in the relation which exists between the words, 'inference' and 'proof.' Whoever justly infers, proves; and whoever proves, infers; but the word 'inference' leads the mind from the premises which have been assumed, to the conclusion which follows from them, while the word proof follows a reverse process, and leads the mind from the conclusion to the premises. We say: 'What do you infer *from* this?' and 'How do you *prove* that?'* Another illustration may be quoted in the synonyms, 'expense' and 'cost.' The same article may be expensive and costly; but we speak of *expense* in reference to the means of the purchaser; of *cost*, in reference to the actual value of the article."

This work does not profess to deal much with *etymologies*; the author thinking that any very strict attention to the *derivation* of words, in connection with synonyms, would only tend to confuse the subject. The history of the origin and growth of words must undoubtedly throw light upon their meanings; but he nevertheless, holds the two questions to be completely distinct and separable; and thinks that, in an inquiry into the *actual* and *present* meaning of a word, the consideration of what it orginally meant may frequently lead as into error. A few suggestive remarks are given upon this matter.

"Our question is, not what *ought* to be, or formerly was, the meaning of a word. but what it *now* is; nor can we be completely guided by quotations from Shakspeare or Milton, or even from Addison or Johnson. Language has undergone such changes, even within the last sixty or seventy years, that many words, at that time considered pure, are now obsolete; while others—of which the word 'mob' is a specimen—formerly slang, are now used by our best writers, and received, like pardoned outlaws, into the body of respectable citizens." The standard, accordingly, to which the author refers in the work before us, is the sense in which a word is used by the purest writers and most correct speakers of our own days.

The synonyms are arranged or classed according to the parts of speech to which they belong—namely, into particles, nouns, adjectives, and verbs. The uses of all the words are well defined, and sufficiently illustrated by examples; a table of contents and a complete index are also added, rendering reference to any word as easy as looking for it in a dictionary. The table of contents, indeed, will be found to serve most of the purposes of a vocabulary of synonyms; a glance at it will frequently give you all the words of similar signification to the particular one for which you may happen to require an equivalent. From the part of the book relating to verbs, we take the following; the words under notice being, *To teach, instruct, inform, educate*:

"Of these words, the first two are often used synonymously, but they have also a distinct meaning 'Teaching,' strictly speaking, when distinguished from instruction, is applied to the practice of an art or branch of knowledge; instruction, to the theory A child is, correctly speaking, instructed in the grammar of a language, and taught to speak the language. Thus, teaching may be merely mechanical; while 'instruction' implies a degree of understanding in the pupil, as well as in the master. A child who has been taught to learn lessons by rote, without understanding them, will find difficulty in comprehending instruction in the principles of what he has learned; hence, we speak of teaching a brute, but never of *instructing* it.

"*Information*,† again, is distinguished from instruction, in relation to the truths conveyed by it. Matters of fact, made known to one who could not have known them before, are called information; instruction elicits new truths out of subject-matter already existing in the mind (see Whately's *Logic*, book iv. § 1).

"A traveller gives us information respecting foreign counries; a metaphysician instructs us in the principles of moral science—principles drawn from facts already known to us. The two processes may take place at the same time; a child learning a lesson receives both information and instruction; he is taught things he never knew before, and also taught to apply and make use of what he does know already. In fact, pure mathematics is the only branch of instruction which includes no information, as the propositions are all based on principles previously assumed. In short, a per-on who is informed, *knows* something he did not before; one who is instructed, *understands* something he did not before; one who is taught, can do something he could not do before.

"Education is more comprehensive than any of the other words before us. It includes the *whole course* of moral and intellectual touching. One who gives occasional lessons is not said to *educate*. To *educate* (agreeably to its derivation, from 'e-duco,' not 'in-duco'), includes the *drawing out* of the faculties, so as to teach the pupil how to teach himself: which is one of the most valuable of arts.

"Moral training, considered *by itself*, is called 'teaching;' this constitutes no exception to the rule laid down, as its object is to enable us not to *know*, but to *do* what is right."—(P. 32-34).

Few words, perhaps, are more apt to be misapplied than the string of adjectives treated of in the section next quoted — namely, *benevolent, beneficent, charitable, munificent, liberal, bountiful, philanthropic*.

"Benevolent and beneficent, together with their conjugates, have curiously diverged from their original meaning. Etymologically, 'benevolent' implied merely wishing well to others, and 'beneficent' doing well; now, 'benevolent' includes both kinds of feelings and actions, and 'beneficent' is restricted to acts of kindness on a great scale, and generally performed by some one of exalted station and character; hence, we speak of the 'benificence' rather than the 'benevolence' of the Creator. It may perhaps be said to follow from this, that 'benevolent' draws our attention more to the character of the agent; 'beneficent' to that of the act performed—retaining, so far, a tinge of their etymology.

"'Charitable' (when not used in reference to a mild and candid judgment of others) seems to be restricted to one kind of benevolence—that which consists in alms-giving.

"'Munificent' resembles 'beneficent,' in referring always to favours on a large scale, and conferred by superiors; but there is this difference, that 'beneficent' alway simplies some real and essential good done, while 'munificent,' as its derivation implies, may be applied equally to any gift, whether really useful or not. One who makes a present of jewelry or pictures to a friend, is munificent, but would not be called 'beneficent.' If he raised a distressed family from starvation, the word 'beneficent' would be more appropriate. But one who gives largely to the public, or to some institution, is called munificent. It seems to convey the idea of splendour. No man can be called munificent who does not give on a large scale.

"Any one who is ready to give freely, as the etymology implies, on whatever scale, is 'liberal.' 'Bountiful' again, is stronger than 'liberal,' and implies giving in abundance; it also differs from 'liberal' in being restricted to giving; while 'liberal' is applied to an easy style of expenditure in general; to the reverse, in short, of 'stingy,' or 'miserly.' Many people live in a liberal style, who are very far from being 'bountiful.' Bountiful always seems to imply giving out of an ample store.

"'Philanthropic,' as its etymology indicates, implies benevolence solely in reference to the human race, and always to masses, not to individuals. One who devises some plan to benefit numbers, is called 'philanthropic;' but we should not talk of 'philanthropically giving a loaf to a hungry child.'"—(P. 33–35).

As space is beginning to press, our last extract must be short; it relates to words often enough employed indiscriminately — *imagination, conception, fancy*. "'Imagination' and 'fancy' are frequently confounded together, but are, nevertheless, very distinct in their signification. In the first place, 'imagination' imples more of a creative power than 'fancy;' it requires a greater combination of various powers, and is therefore a higher exercise of genius. 'Fancy,' on the other hand, is more an employment of ingenuity and taste, though it also requires inventive power. Secondly. 'imagination' implies a longer flight; 'fancy,' rather a succession of short efforts; the one is a steady blaze; the other, a series of sparkles. An epic poem would require an exercise of the first; a ballad, or other lighter production, of the last; hence, we may see that the difference between the two is, in some measure, one of subject-matter; for the same power which we call 'fancy' when employed in a melody of Moore, would be called 'imagination' in the works of Dante or Milton. In short, the efforts of 'fancy' bear the same relation to those of 'imagination' that the carving and polishing of a gem or seal does to sculpture.

"In the third place, wit may come into works of 'fancy,' and could not be admitted into the province of 'imagination.' The same with what are called conceits.

"'Conception' has something in common with imagination, but it implies more decidedly a creative power, and is referred to something tangible and real; whereas, in efforts of fancy and imagination, there is always a consciousness of unreality. The province of 'conception' is that which has a real existence; hence, the productions of painters, sculptors, and musicians, are called 'conceptions.' 'Conception' also denotes something framed and originated in our own mind; whereas the imagination or fancy may be acted on merely from without. The poet or writer of fiction exercises his own conceptions, but awakens the imagination of his readers."

These quotations will give as general a notion of the work as can be conveyed by a few extracts. To those among our readers who may be in quest of such a book, we can decidedly recommend it as one that is certain to be useful. It is by far the best of the kind that we have ever happened to meet with; and we think that if it were universally studied and consulted, the result would be a great improvement of expression, both in common speech and literature.—*Chambers' Journal.*

CURIOSITIES OF GREAT MEN.

THEIR MOMENTS OF COMPOSITION.

Among the curious facts which we find in perusing the biographies of great men, are the circumstances connected with the composition of the works which have made them immortal.

For instance. Bossuet composed his grand sermons on his knees; Bulwer wrote his first novels in full dress, scented; Milton, before commencing his great work, invoked the influences of the Holy Spirit, and prayed that his lips might be touched with a live coal from off the altar; Chrysostom meditated and studied while contemplating a painting of St. Paul.

Bacon knelt down before composing his great work, and prayed for light from heaven. Pope never could compose well without first declaiming for some time at the top of his voice, and thus rousing his nervous system to its fullest activity.

Bentham composed after playing a prelude on the organ, or whilst taking his 'ante-jentacular' and 'post-prandial' walks in his garden—the same, by the way, that Milton occupied. Saint Bernard composed his Meditations amidst the woods; he delighted in nothing so much as the solitude of the dense forest, finding there, he said, something more profound and suggestive than anything he could find in books. The storm would sometimes fall upon him there, without for a moment interrupting his meditations.

Camoens composed his verses with the roar of battle in his ears; for the Portuguese poet was a soldier, and a brave one though a poet. He composed others of his most beautiful verses at the time when his Indian slave was begging a subsistence for him in the streets. Tasso wrote his finest pieces in the lucid intervals of madness.

Rousseau wrote his works early in the morning; Le Sage, at midday; Byron at midnight. Hardouin rose at four in the morning, and wrote till late at night.

Aristotle was a tremendous worker; he took little sleep and was constantly retrenching it. He had a contrivance by which he awoke early, and to awake was with him to commence work. Demosthenes passed three months in a cavern by the sea-side, in labouring to overcome the defects of his voice. There he read, studied, and declaimed.

Rabelais composed his Life of *Gargantua* at Bellay, in the company of Roman cardinals, and under the eyes of the Bishop of Paris. La Fontaine wrote his fables chiefly under the shade of a tree, and sometimes by the side of Racine and Boileau. Pascal wrote most of his Thoughts on little scraps of paper, at his by-moments. Fenelon wrote his *Telemachus* in the palace of Versailles, at the court of the Grand Monarque, when discharging the duties of tutor to the Dauphin. That a book so thoroughly democratic should have issued from such a source, and been written by a priest; may seem surprising. De Quensay first promulgated his notion of universal freedom, of person and trade, and of throwing all taxes on the land—the germ, perhaps, of the French Revolution—in the *boudoir* of Mad. de Pompadour!

Luther, when studying, always had his dog lying at his feet—a dog he had brought from Wartburg, and of which he was very fond. An ivory crucifix stood on the table before him, and the walls of his study were struck round with carricatures of the Pope. He worked at his desk for days together without going out; but when fatigued, and the ideas began to stagnate in his brain, he would take his flute or his guitar with him into the porch, and there execute some musical fantasy (for he was a skilful musician), when the ideas would flow upon him as fresh as flowers after summer's rain. Music was his invariable solace at such times. Indeed, Luther did not hesitate to say, that after theology, music was the first of arts. 'Music,' said he, 'is the art of the prophets; it is the only other art, which, like theology, can calm the agitation of the soul, and put the devil to flight.' Next to music, if not before it, Luther loved children and flowers. That great, gnarled man, had a heart as tender as a woman's

Calvin studied in his bed. Every morning, at five or six o'clock, he had books, manuscripts, and papers carried to him there, and he worked on for hours together. If he had occasion to go out, on his return he undressed and went to bed again to continue his studies. In his later years he dictated his writings to secretaries. He rarely corrected anything. The sentences issued complete from his mouth. If he felt his facility of composition leaving him, he forthwith quitted his bed, gave up writing and composing and went about his outdoor duties for days, weeks and months together. But so soon as he felt the inspiration fall upon him again, he went back to his bed, and his secretary set to work forthwith.

Cujas, another learned man, used to study when laid all his length upon the carpet, his face toward the floor, and there he revilled amidst piles of books which accumulated about him. The learned Amyot never studied without the harpsicord beside him; and he only quitted the pen to play it. Bentham, also, was extremely fond of the pianaforte, and had one in nearly every room in his house.

Richélieu amused himself in the intervals of his labour, with a squadron of cats, of whom he was very fond. He used to go to bed at eleven at night, and after sleeping three hours, rise and write, dictate or work, till from six to eight o'clock in the morning, when his daily levee was held. This worthy student displayed an extravagance equalling that of Wolsey. His annual expenditure was some four millions of francs, or about £170,000 sterling.

How different the fastidious temperance of Milton! He drank water and lived on the humblest fare. In his youth, he studied during the greatest part of the night; but in his more advanced years he went early to bed—by nine o'clock—rising to his studies at four in summer and five in winter. He studied till mid day; then he took an hour's exercise, and after dinner he sang and played the organ, or listened to others' music. He studied again till six, and from that hour till eight he engaged in conversation with friends who came to see him. Then he supped, smoked a pipe of tobacco, drank a glass of water, and went to bed. Glorious visions came to him in the night, for it was then, while lying on his couch, that he composed in thought the greater part of his sublime poem. Sometimes when the fit of composition came strong upon him, he would call his daughter to his side, to commit to paper that which he had composed.

Milton was of opinion that the verses composed by him between the autumnal and spring equinoxes were always the best, and he was never satisfied with the verses he had written at any other season. Alfieri, on the contrary, said that the equinoctial winds produced a state of almost 'complete stupidity' in him. Like the nightingales, he could only sing in summer. It was his favourite season.

Pierre Corneille, in his loftiest flights of imagination, was often brought to a stand still for want of words and rhyme. Thoughts were seething in his brain, which he vainly tried to reduce to order, and he would often run to his Thomas 'for a word.' Thomas rarely failed him. Sometimes, in his fits of inspiration, he would bandadge his eyes, throw himself on the sofa, and dictate to his wife, who almost worshipped his genius. Thus he would pass whole days, dictating to her his great tragedies; his wife scarcely ventured to speak, almost afraid to breathe. Afterwards, when a tragedy was finished, he would call in his sister Martha, and submit it to her judgment; as Moliere used to consult his old housekeeper about the comedies he had newly written.

Racine composed his verses while walking about, reciting them in a loud voice. One day, when thus working at his play of *Mithridates*, in the Tuileries Gardens, a crowd of workmen gathered around him, attracted by his gestures; they took him to be a madman about to throw himself into the basin. On his return home from such walks, he would write down scene by scene, at first in prose, and when he had thus written it out, he would exclaim—'My tragedy is done,' considering the dressing of the acts up in verse as a very small affair.

Magliabecchi, the learned librarian to the Duke of Tuscany, on the contrary, never stirred abroad, but lived amidst books, and lived upon books. They were his bed, board and washing. He passed eight and forty years in their midst, only twice in the course of his life venturing beyond the walls of Florence; once to go two leagues off, and the other three and a half leagues by order of the Grand Duke. He was an extremely frugal man living upon eggs, bread and water, in great moderation.

The life of Liebnitz was one of reading, writing and meditation. That was the secret of his prodigious knowledge. After an attack of gout, he confined himself to a diet of bread and milk. Often he slept in a chair; and rarely went to bed till after midnight. Sometimes he was months without quitting his seat, where he slept by night and wrote by day. He had an ulcer in his right leg which prevented his walking about, even had he wished to do so.—*Eliza Cook's Journal.*

WAT TYLER.

[From 'A Child's History of England.' By Charles Dickens.]

Richard, son of the Black Prince, a boy eleven years of age, succeeded to the Crown under the title of King Richard the Second. The whole English nation were ready to admire him for the sake of his brave father. As to the lords and ladies about the Court, they declared him to be the most beautiful, the wisest, and the best—even of princes—whom the lords and ladies about the Court generally declare to be the most beautiful, the wisest, and the best of mankind. To flatter a poor boy in this base manner was not a very likely way to develop whatever good was in him; and it brought him to anything but a good or happy end.

The Duke of Lancaster, the young King's uncle—commonly called John of Gaunt, from having been born at Ghent, which the common people so pronounced—was supposed to have some thoughts of the throne himself; but, as he was not popular, and the memory of the Black Prince was, he submitted to his nephew.

The war with France being still unsettled, the Government of England wanted money to provide for the expenses that might arise out of it; accordingly a certain tax, called the Poll-tax, which had originated in the last reign, was ordered to be levied on the people. This was a tax on every person in the kingdom, male and female, above the age of fourteen, of three groats (or three fourpenny pieces) a year; clergymen were charged more, and only beggars were exempt.

I have no need to repeat that the common people of England had long been suffering under great oppression. They were still the mere slaves of the lords of the land on which they lived, and were on most occasions harshly and unjustly treated. But, they had begun by this time to think very seriously of not bearing quite so much, and probably, were emboldened by that French insurrection I mentioned in the last chapter.

The people of Essex rose against the Poll-tax, and being severely handled by the government officers, killed some of them. At this very time one of the tax-collectors, going his rounds from house to house, at Dartford, in Kent, came to the cottage of one Wat, a tiler by trade, and claimed the tax upon his daughter. Her mother, who was at home, declared that she was under the age of fourteen; upon that, the collector (as other collectors had already done in different parts of England) behaved in a savage way, and brutally insulted Wat Tyler's daughter. The daughter screamed, the mother screamed, Wat the Tiler, who was at work not far off, ran to the spot, and did what any honest father under such provocation might have done—struck the collector dead at a blow.

Instantly the people of that town uprose as one man. They made Wat Tyler their leader; they joined with the people of Essex, who were in arms under a priest called Jack Straw; they took out of Maidstone prison another priest named John Ball; and, gathering in numbers as they went along, advanced, in a great confused army of poor men, to Blackheath. It is said that they wanted to abolish all property, and to declare all men equal. I do not think this very likely; because they stopped the travellers on the roads and made them swear to be true to King Richard and the people. Nor were they at all disposed to injure those who had done them no harm, merely because they were of high station; for, the King's mother, who had to pass through their camp at Blackheath, on her way to her young son, lying for safety in the Tower of London, had merely to kiss a few dirty-faced rough-bearded men who were noisily fond of royalty, and so got away in perfect safety. Next day the whole mass marched on to London Bridge.

There was a drawbridge in the middle, which William Walworth, the Mayor, caused to be raised to prevent their coming into the city; but they soon terrified the citizens into lowering it again, and spread themselves, with great uproar, over the streets. They broke open the prisons; they burned the papers in Lambeth Palace; they destroyed the Duke of Lancaster's Palace, the Savoy, in the Strand, said to be the most beautiful and splendid in England; they set fire to the books and documents in the Temple; and made a great riot. Many of these outrages were committed in drunkenness; since those citizens, who had well-filled cellars, were only too glad to throw them open to save the rest of their property; but even the drunken rioters were very careful to steal nothing. They were so angry with one man, who was seen to take a silver cup at the Savoy Palace, and put it in his breast, that they drowned him in the river, cup and all.

The young King had been taken out to treat with them before they committed these excesses; but, he and the people about him were so frightened by the riotous shouts, that they got back to the Tower in the best way they could. This made the insurgents bolder; so they went on rioting away, striking off the heads of those who did not, at a moment's notice, declare for King Richard and the people; and killing as many of the unpopular persons whom they supposed to be their enemies as they could by any means lay hold of. In this manner they passed one very violent day, and then proclamation was made that the King would meet them at Mile-end, and grant their requests.

The rioters went to Mile-end, to the number of sixty thousand, and the King met them there, and to the King the rioters peaceably proposed four conditions. First, that neither they, nor their children, nor any coming after them, should be made slaves any more. Secondly, that the rent of land should be fixed at a certain price in money, instead of being paid in service. Thirdly, that they should have liberty to buy and sell in all markets and public places, like other free men. Fourthly, that they should be pardoned for past offences. Heaven knows, there was nothing very unreasonable in these proposals! The young King deceitfully pretended to think so, and kept thirty clerks up, all night, writing out a charter accordingly.

Now, Wat Tyler himself wanted more than this. He wanted the entire abolition of the forest laws. He was not at Mile-end with the rest, but, while that meeting was being held, broke into the Tower of London and slew the archbishop and the treasurer, for whose heads the people had cried out loudly the day before. He and his men even thrust their swords into the bed of the Princess of Wales while the Princess was in it, to make certain that none of their enemies were concealed there.

So, Wat and his men still continued armed, and rode about the city. Next morning, the King with a small train of some sixty gentlemen—among whom was Walworth the Mayor—rode into Smithfield and saw Wat and his people at a little distance. Says Wat to his men, "There is the King. I will go speak with him, and tell him what we want."

Straightway Wat rode up to him, and began to talk; "King," says Watt, "dost thou see all my men there?"

"Aye," says the King. "Why?"

"Because," says Wat, "they are all at my command, and have sworn to do whatever I bid them."

Some declared afterwards that as Wat said this, he laid his hand on the King's bridle. Others declared that he was seen to play with his own dagger. I think, myself, that he just spoke to the King like a rough, angry man as he was, and did nothing more. At any rate he was expecting no attack, and preparing for no resistance, when Walworth the Mayor did the not very valiant deed of drawing a short sword and stabbing him in the throat. He dropped from his horse, and one of the King's people speedily finished him. So fell Wat Tyler. Fawners and flatterers made a mighty triumph of it, and set up a cry which will occasionally find an echo to this day.* But Wat was a hard-working man, who had suffered much, and had been foully outraged; and it is probable that he was a man of a much higher nature and a much braver spirit than any of the parasites who exulted then, or have exulted since, over his defeat.

Seeing Wat down, his men immediately bent their bows to avenge his fall. If the young King had not had presence of mind at that dangerous moment, both he and the Mayor to boot might have followed Tyler pretty fast. But, the King riding up to the crowd, cried out that Tyler was a traitor, and that he would be their leader. They were so taken by surprise, that they set up a great shouting and followed the boy until he was met at Islington by a large body of soldiers. The end of this rising was the then usual end. As soon as the King found himself safe, he unsaid all he had said, and undid all he had done: some fifteen hundred of the rioters were tried (mostly in Essex) with great rigour, and executed with great cruelty. Many of them were hanged on gibbets and left there as a terror to the country people; and, because their miserable friends took some of the bodies down to bury, the King ordered the rest to be chained up—which was the beginning of the barbarous custom of hanging in chains. The King's falsehood in this business makes such a pitiful figure that I think Wat Tyler appears in history as beyond comparison the truer and more respectable man of the two.

* The Hon. Abbot Lawrence, the American Minister at the Court of St. James, said, recently, at a public banquet given by the Fishmonger's Guild, in London: 'This corporation has the honour of numbering among its members the man who slew Wat Tyler.'—*Ed. Standard.*

Pen and Ink Sketch of Carlyle.—Of the people I saw in London, you will wish me to speak first of the Carlyle. Mr. C. came to me at once, and appointed an evening to be spent with him. He was in a very sweet humour, full of wit and pathos, without being overbearing or oppressive. I was quite carried away with the rich flow of his discourse; and the hearty, noble earnestness of his personal being brought back the charm which once was upon his writing, before I wearied of it. I admired his Scotch, his way of singing his great full sentences, so that each one was like the stanzas of a narrative ballad. He let me talk now and then, enough to free my lungs and change my position, so that I did not get tired. That evening, he talked of the present state of things in England, giving light, witty sketches of the men of the day, fanatics and others, and some sweet, homely stories he told of things he had known of the Scotch peasantry. Of you he spoke with hearty kindness: and he told with beautiful feeling the story of some poor farmer, or artisan, in the country, who on Sundays lays aside the cark and care of that dirty English world, and sits reading the essays and looking upon the sea. I left him that night, intending to go out very often to their house I assure you there was never anything so witty as Carlyle's description of —— ——. It was enough to kill one with laughing. I, on my side, contributed a story to his fund of anecdote on this subject, and it was fully appre